

Eloquence and Music: the *Querelle des Bouffons* in Rhetorical Context

Benjamin C. Young

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

2013

ABSTRACT

Eloquence and Music: the *Querelle des Bouffons* in Rhetorical Context

Benjamin C. Young

This dissertation examines the way in which the *querelle des bouffons* was conceived as abiding by the principles of eloquence, using previous rhetorical quarrels (including the Ancients and Moderns, and Atticism versus Asianism), as well as the fundamental tenets of both eloquence and music, to frame a wide-ranging debate that ultimately rethinks the two arts' roles. The supporters of Italian music (known as the *coin de la reine*) and the partisans of French music (known as the *coin du roi*) adhere to this common context, while defining the selection of its essential components, as well as their makeup, according to the values of their given side. I contend that it is the relationship between eloquence and music that allows the quarrel's thinkers—which include Rousseau, Diderot, Grimm, D'Alembert and Rameau, as well as lesser-known figures such as Castel, Caux de Cappeval, Cazotte and Jourdan—to engage in complex intellectual explorations that use the quarrel's innate divisiveness as a means of creating meaningful dialog. Through a system of multi-layering and intricate referencing—and based on a valuing of the essential and an evacuation of the ornamental—the quarrel's texts themselves determine the debate's corpus, hinting at a new direction for this type of public discourse. The dissertation aims to show that the resulting theoretical considerations use the pamphlets' broad dualities of French and Italian, modern and ancient, harmony and melody, etc., to foster internal multiplicities in the development of subtext and cross-referencing, yielding a new collective, written conversation that achieves a form of musical eloquence.

Contents

Acknowledgements	iii
Dedication	iv
Introduction – Situating the <i>Querelle des Bouffons</i> in Its Rhetorical Context	1
Chapter 1 – Preconceived Notions of Eloquence and Music	25
I. A quarrel patterned on eloquence	27
Some basic premises of eloquence that guide the debate and the reader.....	27
Reaching a wide audience through multi-leveled texts	47
In the experimental lab: comparisons of French and Italian music	55
II. Team-building through music	63
Varying conceptions of music as rhetoric.....	66
A foreign affair: questions of origins.....	73
The evolution of French style and taste	90
Building a better battle: strategies of attack and defense.....	101
Chapter 2 – Beyond the Pleasure Principle: Eloquent Music and Musical Eloquence	117
I. The queen of hearts: eloquence and music at the service of <i>movere</i>	121
Eloquence and music’s progressive fusion through <i>pathos</i>	122
An inability to move in the other <i>coin</i>	133
II. The convergence of eloquence and music in <i>bon goût</i>	139
Towards a definition of French <i>decorum</i>	130
Eloquence and music as a critique of excess	145

Chapter 3 – Rousseau the Quarreler-in-Chief: Defining Authorship through a Linguistic Conception of Music	169
I. Restoring the author through music.....	172
Respect of authorship: questions of <i>ingenium</i> and originality	174
Designing a defensive harmony	196
II. The French and Italian connections: building a linguistic bridge between eloquence and music	211
No eloquence or music without words.....	213
The intersection of eloquence and music through language, or the recitative	232
Chapter 4 – Eloquence Reconsidered through Music: the <i>Querelle des Bouffons</i> as Conversation	273
I. Defending rhetoric through musical eloquence.....	275
Eloquence as music	275
In pursuit of the essential: removing ornamentation.....	286
A melodious return to antiquity	310
II. The quarrel as conversation.....	322
The quarrel’s hidden subtext.....	324
Reciprocity through cross-referencing.....	335
Forming a public conversation.....	354
Conclusion – The Last Great Rhetorical Quarrel: from Duality to Multiplicity and the Elaboration of a New Musical Eloquence	381
Bibliography	419

Acknowledgments

I owe a debt of gratitude to my advisor, Pierre Force, and my two other readers, Joanna Stalnaker and Giuseppe Gerbino, who graciously—or should I say heroically—suffered through drafts at various stages of the writing process and provided invaluable counsel. My efforts at clarity and concision did not reach the point I had hoped when I set out to complete this project, but the assistance provided by all certainly resulted in many improvements. I should also like to thank Marc Fumaroli for his unflinching support and encouragement since my first stint as his research assistant in 2007, as well as Sara Melzer and Emily Apter, whose generous confidence in my abilities early on helped propel my studies forward. I am also very appreciative that Dorothea von Mücke and Benoît Bolduc agreed to serve on my dissertation committee. Among the many others who helped make this journey more productive and pleasant than it would have been otherwise, special thanks are due to Jan Allen of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences (presently at Cornell), Isabelle Chagnon, Benita Dace and Meritza Moss, who comprise the remarkable staff of the Department of French and Romance Philology, Sarah Monks of the Institute for Comparative Literature and Society, and Peter Israel, a friend and former publisher who understands better than most the challenges of this undertaking and provided some much-needed prodding.

To Béatrice Losice and Joël Malrieu, two distinguished professors who were instrumental in the formation of a young mind during my years at the Lycée Victor Hugo in Paris.

– Introduction –
Situating the *Querelle des Bouffons* in Its Rhetorical Context

The *querelle des bouffons* is one of those singular moments in the eighteenth century that scholars in literature, history, musicology and philosophy know to have been a highly-impactful debate. Indeed, many are familiar with the quarrel's broad lines—its division into two camps, the opposition of French and Italian music, and the keen participation of Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Jean-Philippe Rameau. However, all too often and up until fairly recently, the *querelle* was reduced to a clash between strong personalities and painted as a destructive or intolerant dispute. It has become evident that this is a misreading. Studying the debate in its rhetorical context sheds some light on the serious work that was put into its conception and unfolding, as well as the way in which the quarrel is in truth highly nuanced. This dissertation is interested in both the quarrel itself—its basic foundation on and interest in the notion that people quarreling yield something of value, as well as its considerations about music and what can be learned from the latter—and its form—how music borrows from eloquence and the way in which music is model for the quarrel's construction. An examination of the framework provided by eloquence will thus help explain the quarrel's intellectual reasons for being, beyond the oft-mentioned personal attacks and defense of national pride. It is eloquence that gives the debaters a common structure to

shape, comment and judge the arguments formed by the quarrel's two factions, while the two distinct approaches to viewing the relationship between eloquence and music draw on these elements to create a discussion that values precepts from both domains. It is my contention that this relationship brings about a shift that allows music's position to change from what Catherine Kintzler terms "une poétique"¹ (a significant, literary object but never the dominant component in classical French opera) to a guiding force. Just like the literary corpus, music too is judged during the *querelle* in relation to eloquence, in part because compositional practices are based on rhetorical principles but also because the debate is framed by eloquence: both the critical commentary of the quarrel and the musical material being analyzed are evaluated according to the tenets of eloquence. And although its position as a guide applies outside of its own arena—as if crossing disciplines is somehow more permissible than giving music a type of power within its own form that has traditionally been forbidden—, my central thesis is that music's new position is achieved through its relation to eloquence: as the quarrel progresses, music's depiction as capable of not only fulfilling rhetorical principles but also teaching eloquence how to achieve these leads the reader to decipher the complex thematic debates through the careful observation of the two *coins*' competing views. In our examination of the way in which the quarrelers conceive the relationship between eloquence and music, we will therefore look at the participants' use of rhetoric for polemical purposes (through the very division into two *coins* and the use of common principles for debating with and judging each other) and as a frame that is both vital to the elaboration of a debate on a grand scale and to the reader's understanding of its inner workings, as well as the way in which eloquence provides a way of better understanding

¹ Kintzler, *Poétique de l'opéra français: de Corneille à Rousseau*, 16-17.

music (for instance, Pergolesi did not view himself as a member of the Ancients, yet we will see that his music is contextualized by the theorists as representative of the faction within the rhetorical frame of Ancients and Moderns), and vice versa.

The quarrel's unfolding follows the Italian troupe of *bouffons*, who perform *opere buffe*² (also referred to as *intermezzi* due to their short length and insertion, often as comic relief, in between *opere serie* or even within the latter) and lend their name to the debate, from their invitation to Paris in the summer of 1752 to their departure in 1754. Led by Eustachio Bambini, they perform works by Pergolesi, Scarlatti, Jommelli and other Italian composers of the *opera buffa* genre—which is lighter and seemingly far less bound by rules than the French *tragédie lyrique* against which it is evaluated (as is the case even with the *opera seria*, which many supporters of Italian music during the quarrel indicate would be far more appropriate for comparison), for the obvious reason that it is not born out of French classical theater—first in Strasbourg and then in Paris. Their opera is far simpler than the French one, devoid of machinery and featuring a small ensemble of players (often with just two main singers) who depict everyday domestic situations, rather than stories of royalty and deities. Giovanni Battista Pergolesi is a favorite of the French audience and his work *La Serva Padrona* (published in 1731

² The *opera buffa* or Italian comic opera plays by the rules of *opera seria* (the serious genre that gives rise to what we think of as opera today), frequently pushed to the extreme as a form of parody that contributes to its comedic aspect. Andrea Fabiano notes in *La “Querelle des Bouffons” dans la vie culturelle française du XVIIIe siècle*, 2, that the French are unfamiliar with these rules and that this helps create an impression of liberty. Nevertheless, many commentators in the *coin de la reine* appreciate these works precisely for their structure and the differences in approach as compared to French opera, recognizing a set of precepts that they see as closer to achieving ideal music.

and first performed in Paris at the Hôtel de Bourgogne³ in 1746 to little acclaim) forms the troupe's inaugural performance in August 1752, placing the composer at the heart of the dispute. Indeed, the *querelle*'s two corners—the *coin de la reine*, composed of those who support Italian music and sit under the queen's loge, and the *coin du roi*, made up of French music's defenders who logically assemble on the opposite side of the opera's *parterre*, under the king's loge—quickly form, and *La Serva Padrona* (usually translated as *The Maidservant* for its leading character, who successfully demands to wed her bourgeois master following his decision to seek a wife) is held up by the partisans of Italian music as the incarnation of their ideals. In due course, their opponents—through a manipulation operated by Rousseau, as we will see—select Rameau and his opera *Armide* as the emblem of their musical aspirations. This idea of contrasting two model works is suggested by Diderot and others, and a lesser level of comparison (because not of works determined to be on equal footing) already exists, as pieces from both the Italian and French repertoire are played side by side (and accompanied by the French opera's orchestra). Thus, on the *bouffons*' opening night, Lully's *Acis et Galatée* was performed along side Pergolesi's *intermezzo*. Since Pergolesi's death in 1736, the composer's

³ The Hôtel de Bourgogne (Paris' first public theater) was home to the Comédie-Italienne (also known as the Théâtre-Italien). The latter gave the first, unsuccessful representations of *La Serva Padrona*, before going on to merge in 1762 with the Opéra-Comique (keeping its name, then adopting the latter's). As its name implies, the Comédie-Italienne performed a repertoire influenced by *commedia dell'arte*, while the Comédie-Française (also known as the Théâtre-Français) was responsible for French drama, and the Opéra housed the Académie Royale de Musique (as well as its counterpart in dance). Since the Comédie-Française was the country's official theater and the Académie Royale de Musique detained the king's musical *privilège*, its competitors, such as the Opéra-Comique and the Comédie-Italienne, had to find creative ways to get around interdictions and censorship. To do so, their troupes often delved in parodies and held their performances at the *théâtres de foire*. These were alternative, unofficial spaces that managed to exist under the purview of certain ecclesiastical orders (the monks of each location's corresponding abbey having been afforded the right to hold an annual fair since the middle ages), the two principle ones—the foire de Saint-Germain and the foire de Saint-Laurent—taking place in spring and summer respectively. Nevertheless, from the turn of the century, they were frequently sanctioned (forcing troupes to go so far as to perform entirely using monologues when the official theater obtained an order to prevent any dialogue by their competitors).

works (and particularly his *Stabat Mater*) had become popular in France, leading one to wonder whether there was any sort of coordination in the selection of *La Serva Padrona* as the *buffoni*'s first presentation in Paris. Its previous lack of success would certainly have made it an odd choice but Pergolesi's overall popularity, along with practical considerations including the piece's modest requirements in terms of performers and staging, may have contributed to this selection. Whatever the case, the reaction to the work's renewal on the Parisian stage was immediately and overwhelmingly positive.

Part of the reason for this success has to do with the quarrel of French and Italian music engaged in almost exactly fifty years prior to the *bouffons*' arrival in Paris by François Ragueneau (who critiqued composers such as Lully and Campra following his return from Rome in his 1702 *Parallèle des Italiens et des Français en ce qui regarde la musique et les opéras*) and Jean-Laurent Le Cerf de la Viéville (who, in 1704, refuted Ragueneau's claims with his *Comparaison de la musique italienne et de la musique française*, which contains the aptly-named *Réfutation du Parallèle des Italiens et des Français* and resulted in Ragueneau's publishing the *Défense du Parallèle des Italiens et des Français en ce qui regarde la musique et les opéras* the following year). This debate laid the groundwork for the many later works, including Friedrich Melchior Grimm's *Lettre sur Omphale*, that support Italian music and attack specific aspects of the French genre. It also revealed the possibility of examining a music's merits based on its linguistic sources, which leads Rousseau to his central thesis. Interestingly, Le Cerf de la Viéville's persuasive arguments in support of French music accuse Italian opera of lacking the clarity and simplicity of the style he advocates and of being too reliant on technique. This becomes one of the chief arguments of the *coin de la reine* against French music in general terms and Rameau in

particular. So, by the time the *bouffons* are brought to Paris, there already exists strong support of Italian music, as well as an advocating of their music's principles—if originally used to defend French music. The basic premise of the dispute between Ragueneau and Le Cerf de la Viéville also opens up the possibility of a wider debate based on similar themes, and the partisans of Italian music see their advantage in being able to claim some of Le Cerf de la Viéville's ideas to support the Italian style as it exists in Pergolesi's compositions. When he enters the debate, Rousseau further realizes that what was a leisurely deliberation between two men can be transformed into a fast-paced, large-scale quarrel of the minds that addresses the original debate's central points while expanding well beyond these and into literary, theoretical, sociocultural and political explorations.

Rousseau's role in the quarrel's framing can only be described as preeminent: he endeavors with much success to singlehandedly transform the debate into a veritable quarrel by penning his controversial *Lettre sur la musique française* in November 1753. Prior to this, the first phase gradually increased in intensity—beginning with Grimm's *Lettre sur Omphale*,⁴ written prior to the beginning of the quarrel (which, as we noted, coincides with the arrival of the *bouffons* and the consequent formation of a division on the opera's *parterre*) but finding itself

⁴ For questions of dating and authorial attribution (many of the pamphlets having been published anonymously), we defer to Denise Launay's meticulous work (which she explains in *La Querelle des Bouffons: Texte des Pamphlets*, xxii-xviii, relies on archival work as well as previous scholarly research). The texts selected are those which are recognized as important by the participants (see Chapter 4 for an explanation of this process) and those that are most interesting due to their content (whether in the presentation of new ideas, analyses of other works, developed commentary or integration of rhetorical principles). They are almost all drawn from Launay's compendium, with a few additions (the Abbé François Arnaud's *Lettre sur la musique française à M. le Comte de Caylus*, in Laborde, *Essai sur la musique ancienne et moderne*, and excerpts from Grimm's *Correspondance littéraire, philosophique et critique*, published posthumously), as well as some writings directly related to the quarrel but written shortly before (as in the Père Yves-Marie André's *Essai sur le beau* or Pierre Estève's *L'Esprit des beaux-arts*) or casting a retrospective look (in the case of Rousseau's *Examen de deux principes avancés par M. Rameau* and *Essai sur l'origine des langues, où il est parlé de mélodie et de l'imitation musicale*).

integrated into the corpus⁵ by Rousseau—but was not clearly organized in a fashion that would have allowed the two corners to coalesce around their respective focal points. Rousseau satisfies this lacuna by defining the notions that will be central to the participants: in opening the quarrel's second phase with his *Lettre*, he lays down precisely the *coin de la reine*'s aims and axes of exploration, while effectively mapping out the *coin du roi*'s course of action by providing it with points to be defended and designating Rameau as the agent of its preferred music. Few of the dualities that arrive with this decisive moment had existed with any clarity prior to Rousseau's intervention, and neither had most of the potential for the vast explorations that come to be undertaken. So, Rousseau is the discussion's principle framer, both in terms of the quarrel's content and the way in which it unfolds. Kintzler shows that Rousseau uses his writings about music not so much for attacks as to construct a philosophy,⁶ but he also seeks out conflict, using the principles of eloquent debate and their musical embodiments to engage in exchanges, as well as to mold his own theoretical contributions. Eloquence and philosophy are therefore both vital aims but, within the quarrel, the former serves as the overarching guide that—thanks to its relationship with music—provides the rules by which all participants must adhere and be judged.

The other main contributors⁷ include the aforementioned Baron von Grimm, who arrived in Paris from his native Germany in 1748 as the tutor to one of count of Schönberg's sons (and would go on to become a naturalized French citizen). In the few years before the start of the

⁵ This is fully explained in Chapter 1, and the success of Rousseau's attempt to make Grimm's *Lettre sur Omphale* part of the quarrel is attested to in Morand and Estève's subsequent indication that the quarrel begins with this text (*Justification de la musique française. Contre la querelle qui lui a été faite par un allemand et un allobroge. Adressée par elle-même au coin de la reine le jour qu'avec Titon et l'Aurore elle s'est remise en possession de son théâtre*, in *QB*, 1110).

⁶ Kintzler, "Préface," *Essai sur l'origine des langues*.

⁷ Participants whose works are analyzed or cited to a lesser extent than these will be introduced within the forthcoming chapters.

querelle, he befriends Diderot and Rousseau, sharing with the latter a consummate passion for matters musical.⁸ In addition to the *Lettre sur Omphale* (written shortly following the *reprise* of *Omphale* in January 1752), Grimm published in early January of 1753 *Le Petit Prophète de Boehmischbroda*, which is both one of the most important texts of the quarrel—spawning several responses—and the one that established its author’s own literary reputation. The pamphlet is a mix of fantasy and reality: among the fictional characters and events, Boehmischbroda (Cesky Brod) is a town in the outskirts of Prague and the context is that of the war of the Austrian Succession.⁹ So, a basis in reality, whether contemporary or ancient, contributes to the believability and seriousness of the stories, as well as their authors’ *ethos*, constituting an example of the way in which eloquence is used to persuade the reader. The interplay that results from Grimm’s first contribution following the *bouffons*’ arrival in Paris is certainly part of the inspiration behind the way Rousseau conceives not only the *coin de la reine*’s role but also the debate as a whole. Indeed, Rousseau pens a response to Grimm’s *Lettre sur Omphale* (his *Lettre à M. Grimm*) in April 1752, prior to the opening representation of *La Serva Padrona* on August 1 of the same year. In it, he defends Grimm against an anonymous critical respondent’s attacks, while also laying the groundwork for the sanction of Italian music and its related principles. The seeds of the debate are therefore planted prior to the *bouffons*’ actual presence.

Once the Italian troupe arrives, it takes four months for the *coin de la reine* to produce its next attack on French music, thanks to the efforts of another naturalized French thinker of German descent, Paul-Henri Thiry (or Paul Heinrich Dietrich) Holbach, and his *Lettre à une*

⁸ The two remain close until Grimm entered into a relationship with Madame d’Épinay, one of Rousseau’s benefactors, and ends to their friendship.

⁹ This is pointed out by Françoise Pelisson-Karo, in Fabiano, *La “Querelle des Bouffons” dans la vie culturelle française du XVIIIe siècle*, 127.

dame d'un certain âge. His wealth allows the Baron d'Holbach to host dinners for illustrious figures including Buffon, Condillac, Helvetius and Turgot, as well as fellow quarrelers D'Alembert, Diderot and Rousseau. In addition to working on translations of German treatises for the *Encyclopédie*, he will go on to become known in the decades following the *querelle* for his trenchant views on religion and politics (denying the existence of God and penning what some have called the first whispers of revolutionary thought). In fact, his reputation allows him to become the second best-selling author of illegal publications in the second half of the eighteenth century.¹⁰ With Holbach's letter dating from November 1752, the debate is off to a relatively slow start, and Grimm helps step up the pace with his *Petit Prophète*, which we saw generates a discussion of its own. The first quarter of 1753 is particularly active, with Denis Diderot's *Les Trois Chapitres* and the letters of the King of Prussia on the Italian side, and the *coin du roi* seeing a veritable multitude of pamphlets, including key contributions such as Jacques Cazotte's *La Guerre de l'opéra* and Jean-Baptiste Jourdan's¹¹ two *Lettres critiques*. Cazotte will also be the first in a long series to pen a response to Rousseau's *Lettre sur la musique française* with his *Observations sur la Lettre de M. Rousseau*, while Jourdan's letters are particularly important in providing a call to arms that is very similar to the one Rousseau will undertake in his own seminal *Lettre*. There are thus indications that a conception of the debate as a quarrel is gaining momentum even on the French side towards the end of the first phase, albeit from one of its most engaged authors (Jourdan having been one of the thinkers involved in the

¹⁰ Cook, "Challenging the *Ancien Régime*: the Hidden Politics of the "Querelle des Bouffons,"" in Fabiano, *La "Querelle des Bouffons" dans la vie culturelle française du XVIIIe siècle*, 151.

¹¹ Not to be confused with the Comte Jean-Baptiste Jourdan (1762-1833) who was *maréchal* of France under Napoléon I, little is known about the quarreler Jean-Baptiste Jourdan (1711-1793).

responses to Grimm's *Petit Prophète* and thus one of the contributors who shows himself to take the debate very seriously).

Putting an end to the long silence between May and September 1753, Rousseau intervenes in September with his *Lettre d'un symphoniste*, followed by the pivotal *Lettre sur la musique française* in November, which engenders the debate's second (and final) phase. The *Lettre* sets a fire under the opposing camp, and immediately results in numerous pamphlets that directly deal with Rousseau's claims and follow the rules he has laid out for the debate. These include the *Lettre sur la musique française en réponse à celle de Jean-Jacques Rousseau* and *Suites des lettres* published in November and December 1753 by Élie-Catherine Fréron (known for his review, the *Lettres sur quelques écrits de ce temps* which becomes *L'Année littéraire* in 1754, and his rivalry with Voltaire who went so far as to mold the main character of his comedy *L'Écossaise* after Fréron and refer to the latter's publication as *L'Âne littéraire*), the "Épître dédicatoire" to *La Galerie de l'Académie Royale de Musique*, written in February 1754 by Travenol (a violinist and composer of violin sonatas, as well as orchestral pieces, best known for his disputes with illustrious figures such as Rousseau and his attack on Mondonville in 1758, which is particularly interesting given that the latter's compositions are used as an illustration of good French music during the quarrel), and Louis-Bertrand Castel's *Lettres d'un académicien de Bordeaux*, from the same month. The Père Castel is an interesting figure in French aesthetic theory, having spent most of his adult life working on his idea of building a "clavecin oculaire" (or ocular harpsichord), which would reproduce the colors "associated" with any given note,

generating sound and color at once.¹² He published his ideas on the topic in a 1740 book entitled *L'Optique des couleurs*. One of the quarrel's most reputable scholars, Castel was more widely known for his work in mathematics and natural philosophy: "His mathematical and philosophical works are in great esteem,"¹³ writes Arthur Young in 1769. The reader of his quarrel contributions moreover finds in the ease of his writing evidence of his early training in literature. Also of note is the "Discours Apologétique" from Caux de Cappeval's *Apologie du goût français, relativement à l'opéra*. Published in February 1754, shortly before the *bouffons*' departure, the text reminds its readers that this is indeed a quarrel, with Caux de Cappeval positioning himself as an anti-*philosophe* (which is to say, in his view, anti-eccentricity) and pro-reason. His defense of French heritage is fierce in its unrestrained attacks on the *philosophes*, but it also leads the discussion into new, profound directions and helps re-emphasize the values of his *coin*. In addressing Rousseau's dismissive attitude towards what he describes as mere "Chansons," Caux de Cappeval reminds us that these are in fact part of a "Musique nationale," which constitutes "la plus belle portion des plaisirs de la France."¹⁴ This strong embrace of each side's musical essence is what makes the debate so fierce and simultaneously the perfect forum for an exploration of wide-ranging issues, including a defense of eloquence itself via the notion of musical perfection. Of course, the *coin du roi*'s corpus would be incomplete without a mention of Rameau, if only by the virtue of his compositions and musical theories being under attack by the *coin de la reine*. His *Observations sur notre instinct pour la musique, et sur son principe*, from February 1754, contains a commentary on Lully's monologue "Enfin il est en ma

¹² One wonders whether Castel might not have had a form of synesthesia, whereby he felt sure that certain colors corresponded to specific musical notes.

¹³ Young, *Letters Concerning the Present State of the French Nation*, 262.

¹⁴ Caux de Cappeval, *Apologie du goût français, relativement à l'opéra*, in *QB*, 1552.

puissance” (from Act II, Scene 5 of *Armide*) in response to Rousseau’s dissection of the air in his *Lettre*. Instances in which a composer takes up the defense of a musical work being of clear interest, the pamphlet has been widely studied by musicologists,¹⁵ but it is also a direct response to Rousseau and a defense of harmony as superseding melody (the latter drawing its force from the former, for Rameau), along with all this entails within the debate’s rhetorical framework. In this text, the composer also shows himself not to be opposed to all of Rousseau’s theories, valuing authorship and *pathos*—in addition to a scientific approach and the notion that music inspires text, rather than the reverse. Rameau’s presence is also central in his interaction with Rousseau, which, as we noted, is often the aspect of the *querelle* that casual readers find most memorable. Although the door to personal attacks is opened by Rousseau (whose repeated allusions to Rameau’s compositional and theoretical flaws can be downright savage) and the phenomenon grows with each *coin*’s participants engaging in some confrontations that build on the well-known feud between the two thinkers, a majority of the texts deal with the vast themes hidden beneath what appears to be a duel of temperaments and a restriction to such questions as determining the value of harmony versus melody (which are of little interest if taken too literally). Jean le Rond d’Alembert is certainly one of the contributors interested in complex issues, as seen in his *Réflexions sur la musique en général et sur la musique française en particulier*,¹⁶ and his *De la Liberté de la musique* allows the *coin de la reine* to have the last word, as the quarrel comes to a close. Published sometime around the last performance of the

¹⁵ See, for example, Cynthia Verba’s in-depth analysis of the treatise in “The Development of Rameau’s Thoughts on Modulation and Chromatics.”

¹⁶ The text’s attribution is uncertain and could possibly have been written by the Abbé d’Arnauld. However, the multifaceted aspect of the topics raised, certain stylistic elements and the measured views expressed on key points support D’Alembert being its author.

bouffons in March 1754—and most likely shortly thereafter, with the author looking back on the debate—, the text develops many of D’Alembert’s central musical theories, to the point that Alain Cernuschi notes he repeats sections *verbatim* in his *Encyclopédie* articles.¹⁷ His conciliatory views shine through with indications that French culture is strong enough to see its music undergo an adaptation to the Italian style without losing its essence.¹⁸ Yet, D’Alembert also firmly holds up the essential principles of his *coin* and its ideal music, and presents the quarrel as having been positive in its reinvigoration of a tired, unengaged Parisian public. For him, the place of public debates that adhere to the principles of eloquence is clearly important.

So, the quarrel is organized into two main phases and ends up engaging in a discussion of what constitutes good music and what defines the value of eloquence, but who has won and who has lost this infamous *guerre des coins*? In terms of the duality of two opposed corners, one could declare that Rameau loses: the *encyclopédistes* are undeniably a force with which to be reckoned and the composer’s benefactor—and one of the eighteenth century’s richest patrons of the arts who supported countless Italian musicians and appointed Rameau to lead his private orchestra (which he maintained at a chapel on the grounds of his Passy château, near Paris) for over twenty years, until around mid-1753—, the aptly-named Alexandre Le Riche de la Pouplinière (sometimes referred to as La Popelinière),¹⁹ additionally abandons him in favor of the other side (his tastes being inclined towards Italian music). Musically, Rameau wins by default because of the blow to the performance of *opera buffa* caused by departure of Bambini’s troupe. However, no one person or party truly wins the *querelle des bouffons* from an argumentative standpoint.

¹⁷ Cernuschi, *Penser la musique dans l’Encycloédie*.

¹⁸ D’Alembert, *De la Liberté de la musique*, in *QB*, 2204.

¹⁹ See Rousseau’s *Confessions* or Jean-François Marmontel’s *Mémoires*, for example.

We will see that this is in part because the two sides are in pursuit of similar goals—many of the arguments, such as determining the superiority of melody versus harmony, not being questions that can be decided with any certainty—and that the very real differences in their approaches to the relationship of eloquence and music lead to complex discussions that are more interested with intellectual explorations than firmly declaring a victor.

Mapping the quarrel's rhetorical context helps to understand this, with previous debates and the quarrel of Ancients and Moderns in particular serving as a guide.²⁰ We will see that the latter's influence runs deep but that the quarrelers also seek to differentiate themselves from it and even go so far as to reverse certain of its principles. Nevertheless, being born from the debate on Italian and French music, which in turn used the Ancients and Moderns as its example, the *querelle des bouffons* owes much to past discussions. As previously noted, in the quarrel involving Raguenet and Le Cerf de la Viéville, the latter accused Italian music of being too convoluted, in contrast with French music's clarity. This is part of what inspires Rousseau who uses the same argument for the opposite purpose. Another element that recurs and that finds its sources in the debate of Atticism and Asianism²¹ is Le Cerf de la Viéville's notion of "génie national," which takes *ingenium* and turns it into specifically-French "bon goût" in order to

²⁰ There are a number of valuable studies of the quarrel of the Ancients and Moderns. In particular, see Marc Fumaroli's introductory essay in *La Querelle des Anciens et des Modernes*. Summarily summed up, the seventeenth-century quarrel divided partakers into two groups: that of the Ancients and that of the Moderns. The former valued the principles, largely founded on rhetoric, of ancient Greece and Rome as models for literature, while the latter believed that what had been achieved in the modern era (René Descartes' discoveries, for instance) indicated that Classical notions could be surpassed in all domains. Nicolas Boileau was the chief leader of the Ancients (receiving support from such authors as Jean de La Bruyère and Jean de La Fontaine), and the Moderns were principally led by Charles Perrault and Bernard de Fontenelle. (The debate also had an English incarnation, which began around the same time on the other side of the Channel and continued into the first decade of the eighteenth century.)

²¹ The Atticists, which for Cicero are represented by the simple, old Roman style, defended the traditions associated with Athens, while the Asianists is embodied by the high style and influenced by ideas imported from Asia. Cicero himself advocated a middle style. We will see that the debate has an influence on the *querelle des bouffons* but that some of its principle characteristics are modified or even reversed.

defend the specificity of French taste. We will see that other debates, such as the one on color versus line also have an impact on the quarrel, but the Ancients and Moderns are especially important in that they even play a multifaceted role in the selection of the *querelle*'s topic: not only do Rousseau, Grimm and the other framers from the *coin de la reine* seek to restore certain ancient principles, but there is an ancient influence in the very birth of the opera they so admire. Indeed, the first operas were preceded—and highly influenced—a decade earlier by the rediscovery of Aristotle's *Poetics* in the late sixteenth century. In devising their new form, Jacopo Peri and Giulio Caccini sought to replicate what they believed to be Greek tragedy, viewed as the most eloquent of artistic works. They also placed a marked emphasis on *pathos*' role in reaching the listener through sung discourse, achieving their goal by aspiring to clearly convey one central idea, just as does the *coin de la reine*. For early opera, this was reflected in the use of monody (supplemented by the ubiquitous *basso continuo*), while for Rousseau the identical aims are accomplished via his principle of "unité de mélodie." For the *coin de la reine*, Italian music is ideal precisely because of its direct link to antiquity, which is music's natural source, and it is thus seen as far more rooted in nature than the stilted practices—whether in composition or performance—of the *tragédie lyrique*.²²

The basic principles of eloquence are therefore among the most critical notions that will allow us to define the way in which good music is assessed. There is clear textual evidence that these are acknowledged by both *coins* as the best means of determining the success of musical

²² Italian music has established a very strong following in France and is fully embraced throughout the European continent. The extent of Italian music's influence in Europe and of Pergolesi in particular can be seen in the adaptation of his *Stabat Mater*, attributed to Bach, as "Tilge, Höchster, meine Sünden" (BWV 1083, composed c. 1743-1745 and based on a rhymed version of Martin Luther's Psalm 51).

and textual production, but used in a broader sense than during the quarrel of the Ancients and the Moderns. The first and most obvious component can be found in the three aims of eloquence—*docere* (teaching), *delectare* (pleasing) and *movere* (moving)—, which are sometimes seen as each corresponding to one of the three styles (low, middle and high, respectively). The three “technical” proofs—*logos* (logic, traditionally associated with enthymemes or examples), *ethos* (ethics and authority, which determines how the orator must appear) and *pathos* (the need to evoke passions and have an effect on the reader or listener’s emotions, which is crucial in considerations of music)—are also sometimes aligned in this fashion, although these correspondences tend to be less definitive. Along with the aims and proofs, the concept of *decorum*—or *prepon* in Greek, which can be summed up as the notion of appropriateness in the correspondence of *verba* (style) to *res* (content), such as in addressing a particular audience or reader—is essential and features prominently on both sides of the *querelle*, as do to a lesser extent the faculties of the soul involved in eloquence—*ingenium* (or the idea of natural talent, which is often represented in the French notion of *génie*), *judicium* (judgment) and *memoria* (memory, usually of the orator or the author, although we will see that it gets shifted elsewhere in the quarrel’s theoretical explorations). Finally, the five categories of eloquence are also vital to the quarrelers’ considerations and are comprised of *inventio* (the main idea), *dispositio* or *elaboratio* (the structure of a text or musical piece), *memoria* (which is seen as part of *actio* for some but really constitutes a category of its own as enabling greater creativity, whether it is considered a natural talent as Cicero claims or also a skill as Quintilian contends), *elocutio* (the performance or act of writing, determining expressivity and helping to make arguments clear through the selection of a style), and *actio* (also the performance, through

pronunciation, gestures and the act of giving a speech, as well as the orator's ability to appear as he wants by using technique). Along with these essential precepts, the parts of discourse are often followed and specific genres of discourse—judicial (usually using a deductive style, often looking at the past), deliberative (using examples to address ethical or political issues, often oriented towards the future) or epideictic (discourse of praise or blame using amplification and intended to orient future decisions, situated in the present)—selected based on specific situations and ambitions. However, it is really the aims of eloquence, the five categories, the faculties of the soul and the technical proofs, along with the key concept of *decorum*, that are reexamined and used as both guides and criteria of judgment by the quarrel's thinkers. In so doing, the latter come to an agreement on how to ideally envision both music and eloquence, and reveal certain conceptual differences (such as the two sides' differing approaches to *decorum* or the way in which the *coin de la reine* sees *actio* in musical performance as ideally being unnecessary, while the *coin du roi* views it as an essential component that contributes to music's essence) that shape their diverging views of the relationship between eloquence and music.

The *querelle des bouffons* is highly impactful and contentious, yet it is also well-controlled thanks to the common framework provided by eloquence. The debate is sometimes said to be about everything but music. There is an element of truth to this,²³ but the choice of a musical topic is something its originators took seriously. Even if the theme was born somewhat organically from the pre-quarrel texts centering on opera²⁴ and the debate between Ragueneau and

²³ The quarrel's underlying political, social and cultural themes are unquestionable. See Fabiano, *La "Querelle des Bouffons" dans la vie culturelle française du XVIIIe siècle*.

²⁴ The numerous writings and previous debates concerning music lead François Arnaud to contend that "de tous les sujets, c'est peut-être celui sur lequel on s'est le plus exercé," *Lettre sur la musique à M. le Comte de Caylus*, in Laborde, *Essai sur la musique ancienne et moderne*, vol. 3, 551, which seems to indicate that one would not engage on the topic again without some other motivation.

Le Cerf de la Viéville, when he set about inciting strong sentiments by devising the broad lines that would clearly define each side, Rousseau could conceivably have shifted the playing field from music to painting or some other aesthetic dimension. He could equally have moved the debate into a non-aesthetic arena without too much difficulty. This being the case, why did Rousseau and his fellow framers persist in converging on music? For one, opera (in its French and, of course, Italian forms) is at the height of its popularity in 1752, making it a logical choice for a debate. However, beyond this, the *querelle*'s architects use the preconceptions concerning both eloquence and music as the foundation for each *coin* to build its model of the correlations between the two disciplines. This genuine interest in the relationship between eloquence and music reveals the quarrelers' desire to draw lessons concerning the reciprocal impact of these domains on each other, which will ultimately help explain the *querelle*'s broad implications.

So, how does each side posit the relationship, explicitly and implicitly, and how does this help the quarrel's thinkers frame their debate? The question will be explored throughout the dissertation and will be the primary focus of its first two chapters. In broad terms, we saw that Rousseau's *Lettre sur la musique française* plays a crucial role in clearly defining the *coins*' aims and axes of investigation, which leads to a marked shift in the theories before and after the letter's publication, even for the *coin du roi*. A good example of this is the post-*Lettre* acceptance of the relation to ancient models of recitative by partisans of French music, even if transformations are operated on these ancient roots. Prior to the *Lettre*, theorists tend to flatly deny any interest in such links. For instance, the *coin du roi*'s Claude-Carloman de Rulhière writes in an early 1753 treatise: "Il importe encore fort peu de savoir ici que la Musique nous vient des Italiens, et que leur récitatif ressemble peut-être à la déclamation notée des Romains.

Plusieurs personnes ont été bien aises de faire parade de cette petite érudition; mais elle ne produit qu'un préjugé en faveur de la Musique Italienne, et les préjugés ont toujours arrêté le progrès du goût."²⁵ The fact that music and eloquent discourse may once have been united is not denied here but the relevance of this idea is questioned. For the French side, modern music has been completely separated from its origins and should not be compared to these. Thus, Rulhière goes on to note that the music of either side must "se juger, pour ainsi dire, soi-même: c'est en cela que consiste le vrai goût, il ne juge que par les effets."²⁶ This independence of music both from a comparison to the Ancients and the speculations of non-musicians is intended to give the partisans of French music theoretical and philosophical autonomy. Interestingly, this leads to an emphasis on *pathos* above all, which is deeply opposed to the *coin du roi*'s post-*Lettre* theories. However, the insistence on one aspect of the debate—*judicium*—not only intricately links music to eloquence in its persuasive intent ("les effets" are clearly presented as having a deeply persuasive power and therefore sharing eloquence's main goal), it also leaves open the possibility that the relationship of eloquence and music exists in musical practice and composition, if its relevance in musical commentary seems somewhat weakened here. Thus, both sides use eloquence from the outset but its role only becomes fully defined according to each camp's views following Rousseau's *Lettre*.

Chapter 1 explores the groundwork that is laid in order to make use of this rhetorical context, not only in the application of the principles of eloquence but also in the contrasting of the two musical styles and the elaboration of a textual multi-layering (in the form of the multiple levels of discussion and reading that are incorporated directly into the pamphlets), allowing for

²⁵ Rulhière, *Jugement de l'orchestre de l'opéra*, in *QB*, 442.

²⁶ *Ibid.*

the integration of some of eloquence's complexities. The chapter also examines what enables a clear delineation of the two *coins*, with a focus on a contrasting of the familiar and the foreign, differing views of music as eloquence, and the quarrelers' strategies of attack and defense. It asks what role is played by eloquence, beyond serving as a guide to the debate: is its position restricted to creating the sharp opposition of French versus Italian music or does it facilitate some of the *querelle*'s other aspects? Chapter 2 follows the roadmap elaborated by the quarrel's framers to determine how each side views the central relationship of eloquence and music, seeking out the similarities and fundamental divergences in the two approaches. The *coin de la reine*'s emphasis on simplicity and clarity yields a specific use of eloquence to achieve good music, just as the measure and restraint favored by the *coin du roi* produces a differing approach and a sharp critique of the other side. Still, both corners come to an agreement that music has something to teach eloquence and ask themselves whether its role is purely to provide pleasure (as it is traditionally depicted) or whether it surpasses this function. This allows Chapter 3 to ponder the quarrelers' elaboration of theories, and particularly Rousseau's notion of authorial intent. The latter is found to be constructed from the notion of melody, in its opposition to harmony, extracting from it the essence of what it means to be an author, and pointing to the importance of the Word and the linguistic basis of both eloquence and music. This link is important for both sides (if particularly crucial to Rousseau's theories)—revealing a mapping on the debate of Atticism versus Asianism that brings about basic differences on either side—and reaffirms the recitative as the central component of the participants' view of music. The way in which Rousseau guides the debate and the manner in which others respond reveal a valuing of eloquence that goes beyond a mere application of principles and techniques, indicating that the

chosen framework might have some deeper significance than its opposition of French and Italian initially indicated. Chapter 4 turns its attention to this possibility, looking at the participants' veritable defense of eloquence itself and their use of music as a model for the direction that should be taken. Throughout these efforts, the quarrel's thinkers consider not only eloquence as music but also the reverse concept, using ancient principles on both sides (but assessing them differently) to remove the ornamental and locate the essential. It is the latter that determines the new way in which eloquence should be used, yielding a desire for adaptation that takes rhetoric and merges it with the art of conversation. In so doing, certain complexities come to light and the question of whether eloquence can remain relevant—and whether it will be able to make the leap that has been operated by music—is posed.

Most studies of eloquence and music have been completed by musicologists and focus on the application of rhetorical rules to musical composition. By virtue of its position as one of the more prominent moments in the intellectual history of the eighteenth century, the *querelle's* big lines are known to most early modern scholars. However, precisely for this reason, many assumptions went unchallenged until recently, and much of the work concerning the debate's political and cultural impact has only just begun.²⁷ The texts themselves have also been somewhat neglected in the critical work surrounding the quarrel. They form the nucleus of the pages that follow. My aim is not to replicate in the context of the quarrel the musicological work that has been done in applying rhetoric to music, but rather to closely study the debate's texts in order to ascertain the way in which music and eloquence are valued in similar ways but

²⁷ Scholars of the quarrel agree that Catherine Kintzler's work is essential, and, as examined in the dissertation's conclusion, the renewal of serious investigations into the debate's cultural, social and political impact reached a new turning point in 2005 with the aforementioned collection of conference articles edited by Andrea Fabiano.

approached differently by the two *coins*—how the relationship of the two arts leads to a quest to determine the essence of each and to turn away from technical aspirations in favor of concepts that have a broad relevance. Thus, placing the debate back into its rhetorical context enables us to better understand the quarrel's aims and repercussions: although it plays a role in constructing the debate, eloquence is above all used as a gauge for analysis and a means of conversation. Kintzler sees the quarrelers as examining moral and political topics in order to understand music and it is true that the former make the latter more relatable, but I contend that it is in fact music, in its relationship with eloquence, that allows for an entry into other areas. Music is conceived by all participants (save for Rameau) in its relation to a literary or linguistic inspiration as far as musical content and structure are concerned; yet in other domains, music is able to facilitate or even inspire intellectual production. It does so through its relationship with eloquence, for the thinkers never forget the greater societal context of the quarrel in which they are engaged, which uses eloquence to create, explain and assess the arguments made by those who take part. It is in the thinkers' search for the core components of eloquence and music within each others' works that ideal forms of the two become embodiments of one another, and that preconceptions concerning the former help contain and delineate a contentious debate on the latter. By looking at a theoretical text or the music of an opera, one discovers its eloquence or lack thereof,²⁸ allowing not only for lessons to be drawn but also for the pursuit of abundant topics of deliberation that use the search of core values as their starting point. This yields a remarkably complex discussion that ends up redefining the notion of public conversation and the position of eloquence within

²⁸ This presupposes that an effort to follow the rules of rhetoric was made by the author or composer. However, the quarrel's pamphlets seem to agree that the most ideal forms yield the rules to be followed rather than the reverse, favoring the appearance of a form of inductive reasoning.

literary output. As the quarrel unfolds, it tells its own story, starting with a divisive but practical—and, in the end, fruitful—opposition of two staunchly different *coins*, and evolving under Rousseau's guidance into a defense of eloquence that questions the art's own existence and position in an attempt to adapt to changing times, ultimately reconsidering its very form.

“Une mélodie à l’oreille... une idée à l’esprit.”

—Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*

“Le pressentiment d’un son fondamental entraînant celui de son harmonie, il en suit naturellement en nous la liberté du choix entre tous les sons harmoniques qui se succèdent pour lors; et c’est de ce choix dicté par le bon goût que se forme la plus agréable mélodie.”

—Jean-Philippe Rameau, *Observations sur notre instinct pour la musique*

Preconceived Notions of Eloquence and Music

I. A quarrel patterned on eloquence	27
Some basic premises of eloquence that guide the debate and the reader.....	27
Reaching a wide audience through multi-leveled texts	47
In the experimental lab: comparisons of French and Italian music	55
II. Team-building through music	63
Varying conceptions of music as rhetoric.....	66
A foreign affair: questions of origins.....	73
The evolution of French style and taste	90
Building a better battle: strategies of attack and defense.....	101

In conceiving the *querelle des bouffons*, its framers seek a format that will allow them to break new theoretical ground without overtly shocking their reader, all the while allowing—and even requiring—each participant to firmly adopt specific positions. This is due to a desire by all involved to avoid the indecisiveness that has sometimes existed in other debates. This has the added benefit of allowing for real discussion, as opposed to becoming mired in the minutiae of diplomacy. The thinkers’ solution is to use certain fundamental principles of eloquence, familiar

to all, as the basis—and the means of judgment—for the arguments, as well as for explaining music itself. They operate a surprising transfer from the oral realm of traditional eloquence to a written form that adheres to rhetorical principles and aims but adapts them to the new format by incorporating a multi-layering proper to writing, which can be compared to the way in which music interweaves multiple thematic elements. It is this written approach that allows for a comparison between French and Italian music that dissimulates much wider layers of meaning, and forms the basis of the two *coins* based on theoretical, as well as socio-political beliefs—contrasting differing views of the two musical styles and how they relate to the rhetorical framework. This chapter will examine how the latter forms the basis for the quarrelers' central examination of the relationship between eloquence and music: citing Cicero and Quintilian, and basing themselves on the writings of Aristotle and Plato, the participants reveal that eloquence is the fundamental instrument for engaging in debate about music. I contend that the importance of the relationship between eloquence and music leads to an organization around the traditional concept of attack and defense, forestalling a weak middle ground and ensuring that each side explores to the fullest the intricacies of the way in which each art affects the other—contending that its side captures the phenomenon better than does the other. This is part of what turns the debate into a veritable quarrel, but it is also a choice that ensures that the pamphleteers feed off of one another and work towards the elaboration of theories that incorporate a subset of wide-ranging themes—and ultimately may allow them to break away from strict dualities. The quarrel's leaders are thus led to consider such considerations as the position of the foreign and precisely what makes French taste unique, using the relationship of eloquence and music to delve beyond the surface issues.

I. A quarrel patterned on eloquence

In reading through the vast collection of texts that comprise the *querelle des bouffons*, it is apparent that if participants from both *coins* agree on one point, it is the debate's overarching structure. Many thinkers—such as the *coin du roi*'s Cazotte (a figure who gets his true literary start with the *querelle* and will go on to be recognized in the 1760s and 1770s for his poems, novels and general wit, before being guillotined during the revolution) who speaks out against the “préventions et préjugés d'habitude”—¹ call for a level of increased originality that might seem contradictory to this acceptance of established tenets. However, such rejections of assumptions are intended solely for the content of the arguments being proposed, rather than their form or the underlying principles by which they must abide. As the quarrel progresses, a proper debate fully based on rhetorical principles—which we will see include the faculties of the soul (*ingenium*, *judicium* and *memoria*), choices of genres, the categories of eloquence (such as *inventio* and *actio*) and the use of proofs (*logos*, *ethos* and *pathos*)—is accepted and even promoted by those involved.

Some basic premises of eloquence that guide the debate and the reader

Beyond certain obvious themes that are dear to the authors of each camp, the texts of the quarrel share certain deeper common threads that find their source in certain key principles of eloquence. Some of these are chosen to fulfill specific goals, such as the contrasting of *movere* and *decorum* in the discussion of recitative explored in Chapter 2. (Recitative holds a particularly important position for the quarrelers in that it is viewed as the most innately musical of musical

¹ Cazotte, *Observations sur la Lettre de J.J. Rousseau, au sujet de la Musique Française*, in *QB*, 858.

forms, while also being the most linked to language and the closest to eloquent discourse.) Others, like *docere*, are used as measures of effectiveness. The level to which any characteristic of eloquent discourse is used on either side varies based on its priorities but there is a universal agreement as to the way in which the debate should unfold.

In this application of rhetorical principles, the participants reflect on its transference from the tradition of oratory to the present debate's written form, as well as the way in which music facilitates this task. This is certainly visible in the frequent examination of how best to interact with both the other pamphleteers and one's readers. Thus, an essential component of good rhetoric that is visible in the quarrel's content and form is the principle of education, which is presented as a crucial part of ideal music. Forming the minds of those participating, as well showing the proper way to engage in written debate, are points of honor for both sides.

In the *coin du roi*, one facet of education can be found in the important position occupied by the *memoria* of the reader or spectator: just as incomprehension is often ascribed to a need to be better educated, ease of understanding is proffered as evidence that the goal of education has been achieved. Thus, music's success with the public is a form of validation of this idea, leading Jourdan to write that "les trois quarts et demi des Spectateurs, pour ne pas dire un plus grand nombre, préfèrent un de nos Airs gracieux qu'on retient dès la première fois, à tout le tintamarre d'une profonde harmonie qu'on ne commence à goûter (à ce que disent ces Messieurs) qu'à la douze ou quinzième Représentation."² Just as Rousseau gleefully noted that the king was humming his air in the days following the premiere of *Le Devin du village*, showing that his catchy tunes could easily be remembered after performance, good music also allows a sort of

² Jourdan, *Le Correcteur des bouffons à l'écolier de Prague*, in *QB*, 209.

receptive *memoria* on the part of the listener for the *coin du roi*. Later, we will see that both sides require a level of complexity in music as in eloquence, which relies on the more traditional producer's *memoria* in generating this content. However, the immediate effect of music through a form of simplicity—defined differently by each *coin*—is also a point of agreement from the start, and it shifts the placement of *memoria* from a work's source to its reader or listener.

There is a notion on both sides that the essence of music or discourse can be lost if too many extraneous elements are present, with the definition of these elements varying greatly according to each side. From this opposition is born the claim of simplicity common to the two parties. It can be seen in Rameau's *Observation sur notre instinct pour la musique*, in which the composer reduces everything to the *corps sonore*. The idea of the two orders of *génération* produced by the latter “se réduit à la plus grande simplicité”³ because it puts forth a system (or “Principe”)⁴ that can easily and systematically be applied. We will see that this is vastly different from the simplicity presented by Rousseau but in both instances, the ideal ties music to eloquence through the goal of education. The thinkers realize that a level of accessibility is therefore required to have any hope of success. For both *coins*, this notion of simplicity boils down to stripping the unessential, and we will see in Chapter 4 that each side has different expectations of what constitutes the central aspects of music and eloquence. For Rousseau, everything is dependent on and motivated by *unité de mélodie*, which, at its simplest level, dictates that a guiding single, unified melody presides over all other musical factors. Italian music achieves such ideal simplicity in its ability to highlight this all-important aspect as an

³ Rameau, *Observations sur notre instinct pour la musique et sur son principe: où les moyens de reconnaître l'un par l'autre, conduisent à pouvoir se rendre raison avec certitude des différents effets de cet art*, in *QB*, 1743.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 1746.

equivalent of a guiding thought or central point of persuasion, while the *coin du roi* tends to prefer a simplicity in its fundamental structure that is not incompatible with an overall complexity—harmonic intervals combining to form great density, while nevertheless retaining an innate simplicity at their base.

Such agreements on the basic foundations of the quarrel’s framing—especially in the debate’s initial phase—prompt a practical necessity to find the real points of disagreement between the two sides. Promoting Rameau to a position of leadership on the French side is one of the elements that will allow for a number of clear variances, such as the opposition of melody and harmony. Another element that differentiates the *coins* can be found in the French insistence on traditions as a form of education. This allows for harsh attacks on Rousseau and his approach to education, as seen in comments such as Travenol’s ironic indication that, while others work hard to acquire knowledge, “vous, Monsieur, sans application, sans connaissance, par un pur instinct, vous découvrez avec sagacité, du premier coup d’oeil, et ce qu’ils n’ont pas fait, et ce qu’ils ne feront même jamais.”⁵ A violinist, composer, and respected *coin du roi* pamphleteer, Travenol is known for his embroilment with Voltaire (as a consequence of the latter’s election to the Académie Française, which spurred Travenol to reprint Baillet de Saint Julien’s “bitter”⁶ letter attacking Voltaire and Madame du Châtelet) and his 1758 attack on Mondonville. It is thus particularly noteworthy that this type of insistence on the learning process exists even for the most polemical of contributors. It goes hand in hand with the *coin du roi*’s defense of traditions

⁵ Travenol, *La Galerie de l’Académie Royale de Musique, contenant les portraits, en vers, des principaux sujets, qui la composent en la présente année 1754*, in *QB*, 1495.

⁶ *Dublin University Magazine, A Literary and Political Magazine*, vol. LXVIII, 256.

and reflects its position that intellectual leadership requires years of study and a form of enculturation unique to France.

The approach also encourages in-depth reflection and careful reading, which is dear to both sides, and forms an integral part of Rousseau's theories. If only from this perspective, educating the reader is also an essential goal for the *coin de la reine*. However, a certain individuality is favored in this corner: great thinkers and strong leadership, rather than the perpetuation of communal traditions, constitute the main method of dissemination. In his pamphlet against Destouche's opera *Omphale* and the earliest of the quarrel's texts,⁷ Grimm even goes so far as to laud "l'autorité et le crédit des gens de Lettres," hailing them as "Professeurs de leur Nation et de l'Univers" whose enlightened thoughts guide the masses.⁸ Grimm lays out a number of concepts that will form the foundation of the *coin de la reine*'s arguments, one of them being that if the listener is seduced by Destouche's bad music, it is because, unlike Grimm, he is not "en garde contre les charmes qu'Omphale et Iphis employent pour me séduire"⁹ and may not listen with enough intensity. When one pays close attention (in a fashion fostered by those "gens de Lettres" Grimm so reveres), the "contresens" that Grimm goes on to enumerate become flagrantly obvious, only thinly veiled by the valiant efforts of the musicians to undo the damages of the composer's compositional errors: perfect cadences used when expressing doubt or uncertainty, peaceful music to accompany moments of deep anxiety,

⁷ Although chronologically pre-quarrel and posited by some scholars as outside of the debate (Paul-Marie Masson in "La 'Lettre sur Omphale' (1752)," for example, sees it as an addendum to the earlier quarrel of Lullistes and Ramistes), Grimm's *Lettre sur Omphale* from early 1752 should be included in the quarrel's body of works for its theoretical contributions and the references to it in other texts. In particular, Rousseau finds in the *Lettre sur Omphale* the sources of several of his claims, roping it into the *querelle* from the very onset of his efforts to spark an organized debate, and receiving the author's approbation to do so, as seen in Chapter 2.

⁸ Grimm, *Lettre sur Omphale*, in *QB*, 38.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 16.

supplicating melodies when the queen issues a commandment...¹⁰ All of these illogical choices point to the flawed relationship between text and music in *Omphale*, and the need for a unity of the two that will be so prized by Rousseau. They also serve as an entry into other problematic areas, including how to approach a discussion that broaches complex topics and develop a set of implicit rules to successfully engage in such deliberations. Clearly, one of the prerequisites to a valuable debate for the *coin de la reine* is that the debate be guided by those with the appropriate knowledge and intellectual abilities, with the ultimate goal of imparting at least a portion of these capacities to the other participants.

Another early framer of the quarrel, the Baron d'Holbach, also alludes to the need to educate the partisans of French music. He notes that the only reason they have so long supported their composers is that there was no better alternative and proceeds to describe French misconceptions:

Ils s'écriaient en baillant: Ah que cela est beau ! et nous aurions continué comme eux à prendre l'Ennui pour de la *Dignité*, si ces Italiens, si opposés à notre pompeuse et léthargique harmonie, n'étaient venus nous arracher le bandeau, et nous apprendre que la musique est susceptible de variété, de caractère, d'expression et d'enjouement...¹¹

The need for proper education is present in the notion that the Italians took on the necessary role of teaching the French ("nous apprendre") how to appreciate good music. Since the *coin de la reine* is directly channeling the Italians, the two become synonymous, which will prove both

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 17-19.

¹¹ Holbach, *Lettre à une dame d'un certain âge*, in *QB*, 125.

beneficial and problematic for the partisans of Italian music.¹² At this early stage in the quarrel, however, the *coin* seeks to show that it is only thanks to this proper guidance that the French can learn to un-do their devotion to bad music, which is based on a “préjugé national.”¹³ Indeed, Holbach indicates that “Après les leçons qu’on vient de nous donner, il serait bien étonnant que nous revinssions à une musique gothique et barbare.”¹⁴ At this stage, merely being exposed to Italian opera is a form of education.

Still, there also seems to be a call for a more comprehensive, hands-on version of education, in that the French are still resistant and depicted as ill equipped to understand Italian music. For Diderot, *Le Devin du village* is a good example of good music’s ability to educate in the Italian style, pointing to a problem with music itself, instead of blaming the listeners. In *Les Trois Chapitres*, he thus repeatedly depicts Rousseau’s opera as educating its listener by bringing to life scenes, rather than using simple description. This creates accessibility through a form that grabs the attention and does not seem didactic, while also achieving the greatest authenticity in a form of learning that is true to its medium. As a point of illustration, learning directly from music Diderot chooses to relate the main recitatives as if they were spoken dialogue, rather than simply describing them (as he does for some other, lesser passages) or by directly quoting (as he does for the famous airs). By presenting the big moments in a form directly adapted to the format of

¹² The problems created by this assimilation of the Italians and the *coin de la reine* lead to questions of reliability and legitimacy, as well as the roots of the foreign element examined further on in this chapter. As for the benefits of the two parties sometimes being interchangeable, the main one lies in the *coin de la reine*’s ability to be imbued with the Italians’ authority concerning music. Thus, when Holbach writes that “des études commencées dès la jeunesse la plus tendre, et continuées pendant des années entières, suffisent à peine pour former un Chanteur Italien; c’est assez pour les nôtres de solfier pendant quelques mois; et on les en a même quelquefois dispensés, sans qu’on s’en trouvât plus mal,” *Ibid.*, 131, his corner finds itself promoted to a sort of expert status, achieved through education and unmatched by those on the other side.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 125.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

the story being narrated, he demonstrates how recitative must use its own tools—music itself—and the forms appropriate to a given task—whether airs or recitatives—, abiding by the rules of *dispositio* and *varietas* to construct eloquent speech that achieves the goal of education. Indeed, in music as in eloquent discourse, the narrative follows a progression that focuses on varied goals according to each stage, beginning with the strong appeal achieved through vivid storytelling and overall incorporation of elements that go towards *delectare*. As the music unfolds, it starts to contemplate other objectives, such as the need to educate the listener. In order to maintain the spectator's attention, as well as ensure *decorum* through the correspondence of content and style, variation must be integrated.

For his part, Rousseau addresses early on the importance of erudition and mutual education among the participants of the quarrel. In what constitutes his first contribution to the quarrel, Rousseau establishes the notion of camps in his strong support of Grimm's ideas in the *Lettre sur Omphale* and the virulence of his attack on the anonymous response, the *Remarques au sujet de la lettre de M. Grimm sur Omphale*. His forceful assault on the ineptitude of Grimm's respondent eventually goes towards the idea of education. To prove his point, Rousseau asks the respondent to provide “des raisons ou du moins des raisonnements, à lui qui ne veut passer aux autres que des propositions démontrées,” adding that “il peut n'avoir aucune connaissance des chef-d'œuvres de cet Auteur: mais l'ignorance n'excuse point un homme d'avoir mal dit.”¹⁵ With this statement, Rousseau adds to the importance of originality expressed throughout his works the concept of authorial responsibility: as we are reminded time and time again, those engaging in the quarrel must be up to the task of crafting noteworthy contributions. The leaders

¹⁵ Rousseau, *Lettre à M. Grimm*, QB, 97.

of each side must educate their reader and, clearly, those lacking the ability to reason properly will be unable to fulfill this important duty. Paired with this notion is the reader's responsibility to follow the paths laid out by the authors, thus acquiring the knowledge needed to appreciate the texts' intricate argumentation. So, the silence of Grimm's unworthy "Commentateur" expresses his failure to complete the task—"elle [l'ignorance] l'oblige seulement à se taire"¹⁶—and sends the clear message that, although both *coins* agree that participants need not be specialists,¹⁷ they also demand a certain level of intellectual qualification to participate.

The idea that each actor must fulfill his role and that those actively engaging in the debate will learn from each other and adapt as needed promotes a transformational, pluridisciplinary discussion. On the most basic level, however, Rousseau seeks to offer something of value to his reader, to begin the process of education. This is seen in the early *Lettre à M. Grimm*, when he acknowledges his own text is not as fleshed out as he might like:

... vous avez eu la difficile modestie de ne juger que sur des raisons, et le courage de prononcer avec fermeté. Je me contente d'explorer ces choses; peut-être ne seront-elles louées de personne, mais à coup sûr beaucoup de gens en profiteront.¹⁸

Grimm is presented as worthy of the title of participant or discussant, in stark opposition to his respondent, which is clearly linked to the fulfillment of an educational goal: Rousseau presents himself as learning from Grimm and, in turn, as teaching the readers of his own text. Similarly, the plea for clarity throughout Rousseau's text are not a means of lessening its

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ For further details on this notion of the non-specialist's role in the quarrel, see the examination of the quarrel as a public conversation in Chapter 4.

¹⁸ Rousseau, *Lettre à M. Grimm*, *QB*, 103.

intellectual value but a rejection of that aspect of criticism which seems to favor obscurity for its own sake. That is to say, Rousseau appears to rebuff obscurity without a good reason—though a certain level is acceptable, whether because of the difficulty of the topic at hand or the dissimulation of other elements—, something philosophers and literary scholars wrestle with to this day. Similarly, in the *coin du roi*, Rulhière—a historian of Russia and Poland whose pamphlets are among the most forceful and who was later named to the Académie Française—¹⁹ attacks Italian opera’s pride in *varietas* as a lack of clarity through simplicity,²⁰ an obvious response to Rousseau’s frequent stressing of French music’s lack of variation but also an indication of just how importantly music’s communicative aspect is taken in its rhetorical framework. The quarrelers value *varietas* as a means of keeping the listener interested but clear expression cannot be sacrificed, and—for both sides—simplicity is the most effective way (whether through a clean melody or a clear harmonic foundation) to authentically reflect music’s closeness to nature.

Born out of the principle of education through formal clarity, *logos* is crucial to the two *coins*, if only due to the debate’s argumentative nature, and its alleged lack is a recurring argument used in each side’s attacks. Not surprisingly, the *coin du roi* is particularly fond of this technique as a means of defense, as well as a way of remaining true to its background in reasoned French classicism. For instance, Rulhière links the lack of *logos* in Italian recitative to the *coin de la reine*’s overall lack of organized thought, noting that “il semble que leurs Opéra

¹⁹ A friend of Rousseau and the *philosophes*, Rulhière went on to favor a Franco-Prussian friendship in his *Histoire, ou Anecdotes sur la Revolution de Russie; en l'année 1762* (to the detriment of Russia, where he was Secretary to the French envoy in the early 1760s), bringing to mind Frédéric II’s siding with the *coin de la reine* in the quarrel (and, indeed, his strong support of Rousseau some years later) and demonstrating that certain participants were able to keep their personal connections separate from the debate.

²⁰ Rulhière, *Jugement de l'orchestre de l'opéra*, in *QB*, 443.

soient composés de pièces de rapport; un Musicien qui a six ariettes, ne fait plus qu'un remplissage pour les coudre les unes aux autres. Au contraire, le récitatif Français doit lier toutes les parties d'un Opéra..."²¹ Using recitative as filler is doubly inappropriate: it makes illogical use of a form that is meant to be the most expressive and the most closely linked to transmitting ideas, and it emphasizes the lack of real unity in Italian opera's other parts through this need for empty linking. There is a sense that this can be applied not only to Italian opera but to Rousseau's theories as well, as confirmed in his link of recitative—"la partie du Poème qui contient l'intérêt"²²—to language in a fashion that mirrors the other side's theories and indicates that its failure is reflected in both its musical and theoretical production. The idea is fomented in the Père Castel's portrayal of Rousseau as contradicting himself to an almost-comical extent: all of his arguments are contradicted by his own other arguments at some point,²³ demonstrating a flagrant lack of *logos* in the *coin de la reine*'s theories that reflects a similar phenomenon in the music it defends. In fact, the same contradictions exist in Rousseau's own music, as pointed out by Fréron: "Aussi presque tous ses airs font des contresens manifestes avec ses paroles."²⁴ All of these instances of insufficient or non-existent *logos* are clearly part of bad rhetorical practice but they also allow Castel—a Jesuit scholar known for his 1724 *Traité de la pesanteur universelle*, which defended a Cartesian perception of the universe—to formulate a distinction between the two *coins*, as represented by *géomètres* and *philosophes*. The latter continually blow with the

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² *Ibid.*

²³ Castel, *Lettres d'un Académicien de Bordeaux*, in *QB*, 1390.

²⁴ Fréron, *Lettres sur la musique française. En réponse à celle de Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, in *QB*, 785.

wind and lack the serious, mathematically-logical thought process of the former.²⁵ What most bothers the partisans of French music is that the *philosophes* see themselves as being on equal footing with scientific thinkers, which is a leap of reasoning unfathomable to the reasoned minds of the *coin du roi*.

In the *coin de la reine*, Holbach notes that comparing *Armide* and *La Donna Superba* is like attempting to put Molière and Racine side by side.²⁶ This shows just how strong Italian music is in its ability to take on the greatest French works—a minor, light Italian *opera buffa* being able to stand its own against what many consider the grandest French *opéra lyrique*—but also emphasizes the lack of logic in the opposite corner’s desire to make such flawed comparisons. The general nature of this criticism reflects a tendency within the *coin de la reine* to find fault with the very foundations of the opposite corner’s arguments, rather than dissect their component parts. As such, lack of *logos* is present as part of a wider criticism that finds itself linked to *ethos*. For instance, D’Alembert sees a fundamental incapacity on the part of French composers,²⁷ which leads to poor choices, and Rousseau picks apart the very core of Rameau’s thought process:

Il faut reconnaître dans M. Rameau... beaucoup d’art pour s’approprier, dénaturer, orner, embellir les idées d’autrui, et retourner les siennes; assez peu de facilité pour en inventer de nouvelles... Son récitatif est moins

²⁵ The establishment of this form of hierarchy follows the rules of eloquence. Thus, when Castel notes that “C’est ma façon d’argumenter, du vrai au bon, et du bon au beau: vrai géométrique, bon physique, beau historique ou moral,” *Lettres d’un Académicien de Bordeaux*, in *QB*, 1408, his pride in geometry is evident. These recurrent arguments on the part of the *coin du roi* are a defense of this aspect of argumentation, which the *coin de la reine* in turn uses to belittle the French side.

²⁶ Holbach, *Arrêt rendu à l’amphithéâtre de l’opéra, sur la plainte du milieu du parterre intervenant dans la querelle des deux coins*, in *QB*, 280.

²⁷ D’Alembert, *De la liberté de la musique*, in *QB*, 2249.

naturel, mais beaucoup plus varié que celui de Lulli; plus admirable dans un petit nombre de scènes, mauvais presque partout ailleurs.²⁸

Rousseau rejects complexity for the sake of complication and, although he clearly mourns the absence of originality, the heart of his critique can be found in the indication of Rameau's distance from nature. This lack of authenticity is reflected in the composer's persona and it leads to absurd choices that have no grounding in reality. Thus, Rameau's flawed *ethos* has an impact on his music—his personal artifice and the absurdity of his theories are mirrored in the inappropriate musical choices he makes, as seen below in the section comparing French and Italian music—and cannot be dissociated from the composer's poor *logos*, as we saw above in the attack on *Armide*. Rousseau similarly depicts Rameau as enamored with technique,²⁹ concluding that he is “le premier qui ait fait des symphonies et des accompagnements travaillés, et il en a abusé.”³⁰ Embracing technique in this manner is also a form of disillusionment that leads to strange, self-contained logic. In a way, Rousseau seems to foresee Rameau's downward spiral as a theorist so enamored with his own theories that he will seek to apply them to varied facets of human existence, positing music as a sort of mother discipline, from which others are born.

So, if logic is important, it is in part because an organized line of argumentation is reflective of reliability and provides a greater chance of trustworthiness. *Ethos* thus occupies a central position on both sides of the aisle, and leads the pamphleteers to repeatedly seek to prove

²⁸ Rousseau, *Lettre à M. Grimm*, in *QB*, 112.

²⁹ Indeed, Rousseau goes on to note that Rameau's management of l'Orchestre du Roi has resulted in good technique but no emotion: “Ils assurent qu'ils ont actuellement de l'exécution; mais je dis, moi, que ces gens-là n'auront jamais ni goût ni âme,” *Ibid.*, 113. This is a perennial debate amongst critics and concert-goers alike. Most people tend to take the side of natural talent, which gives Rousseau an edge in his argument.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 112.

their impartiality. For example, in *De la Liberté de la musique*, D'Alembert characterizes French simplicity (in contrast with the beautiful Italian version) as “ce qui est froid et commun, sans force, sans ame, et sans idée”³¹ but immediately goes on to note that Italian music can be terrible and must therefore not be embraced blindly. Clearly, such selectivity demonstrates the author's *bon goût* and qualifications to lead the debate, giving his attacks on French music greater credence. The importance of *ethos* in the *Réflexions sur la musique* is also evident. D'Alembert concludes the text with a request for an approach based on *logos*, stating that music cannot translate certain sentiments.³² For him, this means that those who feel such sentiments while listening to French music are not being logical and cannot prove anything. Since the same could be said of any music, there is an implication that the types of sentiments music can convey are those found in Italian music (based on the idea promoted by Rousseau that they are closer to nature), and the partisans of French music are therefore being disingenuous when they claim their music produces nobler sentiments. So, *ethos* is central both in its validation of either side and in supporting the role of music within its rhetorical framework.

Like *pathos*, *ethos* is also invoked as a means of discrediting an adversary, sometimes in relatively subtle ways. For example, in his direct reply to Voisenon's *Réponse du coin du roi*, Holbach repeatedly characterizes the pamphlet's author as young and impetuous, even going so far as to praise his youthfulness. The compliment, in its repeated insistence, is really a way of pointing out the immature, inexperienced and unproven character of his opponent.³³ The fact is

³¹ D'Alembert, *De la Liberté de la musique*, in *QB*, 2234.

³² D'Alembert, *Réflexions sur la musique*, in *QB*, 1667.

³³ Holbach, *Arrêt rendu à l'amphithéâtre de l'opéra*, in *QB*, 282. The idea is confirmed later, 285, when Holbach notes in a particularly humorous passage that good judgment comes with age.

compounded by the opponent's characterization as the *coin du roi*'s "jeune avocat."³⁴ In this capacity, Holbach's subtle allusions to the misuse of syllogisms takes on its full significance: the young author should be a master of forensic discourse, for which the use of syllogisms through enthymeme is critical. While this is an example of one of the finer technical points that both sides tend to avoid, in this instance it points to the opposing side's lack of proper *logos* and *ethos*: how can debaters who have not learned their craft be trusted, particularly when they make such poor choices as to their representatives? Similarly, Holbach's repeated insistence on his adversary's poor grammar³⁵ is really an attack on his lack of authority, especially given his supposed representation of the intrinsically-*French* side of the debate.

Precisely in order to bolster its authoritative status, the *coin du roi* defends its *ethos* by reminding the reader of its long lineage of credible creators. For instance, Morand and Estève's laundry list of French Classicism's big names³⁶ is a way of establishing the French side's rich background and good character. Additionally, like its opponents, the *coin du roi* sets out to find the numerous inconsistencies that erode its opponents' *ethos* and seizes every opportunity to question the other side's motivations. Along these lines, Rousseau's criticisms of Rameau are more often than not presented as part of a personal vendetta. Castel also points out his adversaries' focus on destroying French music, opposing it to a much more noble calling on the

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 286.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 289. For instance, Holbach repeatedly harps on the fact that "sentinelle" is a feminine word that the author of the *Réponse* mistakenly believes to be masculine. To further stress the ridicule of this happening in the *coin du roi*, Holbach asks his interlocutor to please "parler Français," bringing into question who exactly is foreign in this debate.

³⁶ Morand and Estève—the former being depicted as a thinker of little import by Fétis (*Biographie universelle des musiciens*, v. 6, 191), and the latter having a solid reputation as an aesthetic theorist writing extensively on both painting and music—cite Richelieu, Colbert, Corneille, Descartes, Molière and Lully, among others, in *Justification de la musique française. Contre la querelle qui lui a été faite par un Allemand et un Allobroge. Adressée par elle-même au coin de la reine le jour qu'avec Titon et l'Aurore elle s'est remise en possession de son théâtre*, in *QB*, 1087.

French side—a way of opposing the two sides that goes in tandem with this idea of a greater good contrasted with personal motivations. In order to make the best case, Castel begins by presenting himself like a neutral nation,³⁷ adding that “Il est vrai que je combats ici un peu, mais c’est pour ma nation et pour la Musique en général...” This justification of his admitted bias might be considered amusing, given it relies on patriotism (which is often a root cause of wars) and simultaneously attempts to minimize the idea of conflict, but his justification of music *in general* is revelatory: defending something in its entirety constitutes a selfless act. Castel therefore believes that music as a whole represents a lot more, supporting the presence of the undercurrents examined in the next section. Such a perspective makes what is at stake all the more important—heightening the role of *ethos*—and produces a contrast with the seemingly-narrow focus on the other side.³⁸

Chapter 2 more closely examines how the various parts of rhetoric, and *pathos* in particular, are used to tighten the bond of music and eloquence, but one category—*actio*—is key from the onset in its special relevance for opera and in its relation to the technical proofs. If the participants’ performance is carefully analyzed and often mercilessly dissected as shown above, both sides seem to agree that *actio* in debate as in music is important above all in its relation to *ethos*. In this sense, great music is modeled after great eloquence: *actio* requires more than just acting skills; it assumes an authentic set of talents that, for the *coin de la reine*, are opposed to

³⁷ Castel, *Lettres d’un Académicien de Bordeaux*, in *QB*, 1420: “j’ose me dire impartial et comme neutre dans toutes ces guerres...”

³⁸ The other side is, however, fully aware of just what is at stake. For instance, D’Alembert refrains from citing certain examples of poor overtures in his *De la liberté de la musique*, in *QB*, 2281, because “les Auteurs sont vivans, et nous n’écrivons pas pour offenser.” Others make similar comments and the thinkers are thus clearly conscious that their comments will contribute to each others’ *ethos*, as well as their own (with D’Alembert’s statement obviously working to improve his own reputation of impartiality).

French music's artificiality. Thus, in his description of a young man who does not quite have what it takes to be a great French singer, Holbach notes that “c'est un garçon à qui il ne manque qu'un peu d'oreille et d'étude, pour être un Acteur admirable; et il ne faut pas souffrir qu'on introduise parmi nous une musique qui exige des qualités qui lui manquent, et à beaucoup d'autres qui ne s'en doutent guères.”³⁹ So, while this young man can, without much difficulty, learn sufficient techniques to perform French opera, the faculties of the soul needed for Italian opera, as modeled on eloquence, are permanently out of his reach and the evolved version of *actio* cannot be fulfilled. Similarly, even great French singers are depicted as inadequate to perform Italian opera,⁴⁰ precisely because their abilities are incompatible with Italian music's closeness to nature.

The *coin du roi* makes some similar arguments based on multiple qualities of eloquence. For instance, Jourdan demonstrates the value of performance by claiming that replacing a poor actor with a good one could result in the success or failure of a theater piece. More than pure *actio* (though this is also important, performance techniques being an integral part of any opera, and especially French opera), what makes a piece successful is the performer's ability to properly do justice to it.⁴¹ On the one hand, this stems from the notion of education—this time on the part of the actor, who must have at his disposition the skills needed to carry out his task—, while on the other hand, the recurring idea of *bon goût* can already be seen. The ability to be able to make the right choices is both learned and innate, and this is one quality that simply cannot be

³⁹ Holbach, *Lettre à une dame d'un certain âge*, in *QB*, 130.

⁴⁰ This places a high value on *ingenium* as an important source of the categories of eloquence reflected in music, and in particular *actio*. See Chapter 3 for a look at *ingenium* as part of a defense of authorship.

⁴¹ Thus, the need for “un Acteur plein de talents et d'entrailles,” in Jourdan's theatrical example, *Le Correcteur des bouffons*, in *QB*, 197, illustrates the point.

feigned. Similar to the Italian notion of *actio*, the French idea also incorporates *ethos*, but it seems most closely linked to the notion of *elocutio*, forming a direct refutation to the opposing side's claim that French performance can in any way be lacking. Indeed, Travenol confirms this by noting the French side's view that if its singers were immobile, the music would be equally enjoyable,⁴² an indication of *actio*'s secondary value and of just how heightened French singing technique is believed to be. In another pamphlet, Travenol even goes so far as to claim that Rousseau's *Devin* would have enjoyed none of the success it achieved if it were not for Mlle. Fêl and M. Jéliote.⁴³ The talented French performers manage to make the opera barely mediocre, a feat in and of itself, thanks to their superior skills and French schooling, which are more a part of their *elocutio* than a result of *actio*. The importance of the decision-making process behind *elocutio*—always informed by *bon goût*—and the sense that eloquence results from deep consideration forecast the quarrelers' respect of authorship examined in Chapter 3,⁴⁴ revealing a point of contention that helps delineate the demarcation between the sides. The *coin de la reine* tends to define good *actio* as being as close to the music's intrinsic qualities as possible—the talent essentially residing in allowing music to sing for itself—, the *coin du roi* relies on a form of *elocutio* that places greater emphasis on performance and allows it to elevate bad music, while playing an integral role in good music.

The bond between music and eloquence could not be clearer, Cicero having considered *elocutio* the most rhetorical of the five categories—the one that in which an orator defines

⁴² Travenol, *La Galerie de l'Académie Royale de Musique*, in *QB*, 1500.

⁴³ Travenol, *Arrêt du conseil d'état d'Apollon*, in *QB*, 897.

⁴⁴ Along these lines, *judicium* is primordial for the *coin du roi*, and finds itself posited in a very French fashion by Jourdan in *Le Correcteur des bouffons*, in *QB*, 197: "... la Raison et le bon Goût sont toujours sûrs de triompher de notre frivolité passagère." In essence, *judicium* for Jourdan amounts to an unwavering embrace of Classicism and its values.

himself as such.⁴⁵ However, the *coin du roi*'s primary initial goal is far simpler: it seeks above all to weaken the other side's leader. So, when Fréron and others pepper their texts with depictions such as "quelqu'un qui fait comme vous [Rousseau] profession publique de Philosophie,"⁴⁶ they are attacking what they see as both his inappropriate personal motivations and a more general misuse of certain practices. Not only is Rousseau seeking the limelight, he is also using philosophy as a pretext for this activity. Such underhanded behavior—which also exists in musical production since, as Fréron points out,⁴⁷ there too Rousseau's comportment is far from honest—amounts to lying in order to improve or exaggerate one's *ethos*. Similarly, Bonneval—described by Michaud as "dans la liste des écrivains subalternes et des poètes médiocres"⁴⁸ and by Fétis as a "littérateur médiocre,"⁴⁹ the latter nevertheless noting that his quarrel pamphlet is among the better ones—takes issue with Rousseau's leadership role by commenting on "ce ton décisif et impérieux qui va jusqu'à offenser toutes les femmes, parce que leur coeur a éprouvé ce

⁴⁵ Cicero, *L'Orateur*, XIX, 61: "en grec rhéteur, en latin éloquent, d'après l'élocution. ... la puissance suprême de la parole, c'est-à-dire l'élocution, n'est concédée qu'à lui seul." *Elocutio* involves choosing the right style for a given circumstance but, more fundamentally, it is also about simply selecting the right language and the right words: good *elocutio* plays a big role in achieving persuasion by being invisible, for if there is a perceptible distance between an orator's (or an author's, or a composer's) choices and their execution, an element of artifice becomes apparent and what results is no longer eloquent.

⁴⁶ Fréron or Ozy, *Suite des lettres sur la Musique Française. En réponse à celle de Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, in *QB*, 1011.

⁴⁷ Fréron notes in his *Lettres sur la musique française*, in *QB*, 785, that Rousseau's best airs in *Le Devin du village* are "pillés des Compositeurs Italiens."

⁴⁸ Michaud, *Biographie universelle, ancienne et moderne, ou histoire par ordre alphabétique de la vie publique et privée de tous les hommes qui se sont fait remarquer par leurs écrits, leurs actions, leurs talents, leurs vertus ou leurs crimes*, v. 3, 121.

⁴⁹ Fétis, *Biographie universelle des musiciens*, v. 2, 19.

que doit nécessairement opérer la bonne Musique”⁵⁰ in one of several allusions by the *coin du roi* to Rousseau’s use of improper—or at least non-idiomatic—forms of address towards women.⁵¹ This amounts to a sort of abuse of position applied to music that directly goes against *decorum* (the style being completely inappropriate for the intended audience) and erodes Rousseau’s *ethos*, especially given that the *coin de la reine* has itself acknowledged women’s position of discernment by addressing to them many of their texts.⁵² In addition to directly reflecting Italian music’s inappropriate mixing of genres, this series of unfitting attitudes also shows Rousseau’s lack of credibility both as a leader in the debate and as the representative of France he claims to be. It is therefore no surprise that, when Travenol purports to have espoused Rousseau’s ideals to a group of amateurs of French music, their first reaction is to ask who he is and inquire about his

⁵⁰ Bonneval, *Apologie de la Musique et des musiciens français, contre les assertions peu mélodieuses, peu mesurées et mal fondées du Sieur Jean-Jacques Rousseau, ci-devant citoyen de Genève*, in *QB*, 1067. Rousseau’s use of discourteous vocabulary is noted by several *coin du roi* theorists and this lack of proper respect reflects on Italian music’s incongruity. It is also particularly interesting in that it might indicate a recognition of Rousseau’s misogyny by his contemporaries, although the criticisms seem to be more interested with Rousseau’s self-infatuation and his pompous attitude being the mirror of Italian music’s success having gone to its supporters’ heads.

⁵¹ Another such instance can be found in Castel’s fifth letter, in which the author gives a rather complicated explanation of proper *decorum* relating to regional idiomatic expressions. The main point boils down to Rousseau having written “nos femmes” when it customary to use the expression “notres femmes” in “villageois” speech (*Lettres d’un académicien de Bordeaux*, in *QB*, 1409). The passage is overtly referential to Bonneval who developed his theory in the month prior. As examined further on in this chapter, this is a clear indication for the *coin du roi* that Rousseau does not grasp the subtleties of the country, its language or its culture as well as he thinks. For Castel, this means that Rousseau not respect the “Dames” as he should and the result is a damaged *ethos* within a larger misunderstanding of the country Rousseau attempts to portray as his own by adoption. Given Rousseau’s insistence on language-based theories, this attack amounts to using Rousseau’s game to his own detriment, showing both inconsistency in *logos* (matched by Rousseau’s similar inconsistencies in his musical compositions) and the sad state of his *ethos*.

⁵² Interestingly, Rousseau’s *Lettre sur la musique française* is a notable exception, addressed to a “Monsieur.” This contributes to the implicit depictions of Rousseau as not being culturally French and as failing to respect women’s role (as seen in footnote 51), and the faux pas does not go unnoticed by Caux de Cappeval in his *Apologie du goût français*, in *QB*, 1560.

history.⁵³ Clearly, the debate must be restricted to those with the proper qualifications, rather than those who proclaim themselves its leaders.

Reaching a wide audience through multi-leveled texts

The quarrelers' agreement on rhetoric as the most valid mechanism to effectively debate not just on music but on a variety of topics leads to the development of multi-layering within the quarrel's texts. Although the practice that results from this idea will be engaged in by both sides, the concept of embedding multiple levels is mostly conceptualized by the initial framers of the *coin de la reine*. In fact, proposing layers of meaning that are intended to be decoded by respondents and readers at varying levels is one of the ways the quarrel's participants create a debate patterned on eloquence but transferred to the written form. After all, reaching a wide audience and fulfilling each reader's potential to the fullest are essential components of good rhetoric and, while an orator can adjust his speech to a given audience, and author must incorporate this quality into his text at its inception. For this reason, both *coins* favor a textual layering that takes a cue from music's ability to contain many levels, all the while being thrown down on a page in a manner that maintains a sort of unity that conveys the original *ingenium* in a unique fashion⁵⁴ best matched by written eloquence. It is particularly interesting that this approach, so valued by the Italianists, is essentially French in nature: its roots lie in the type of

⁵³ Travenol, *La Galerie de l'Académie Royale de Musique*, in *QB*, 1494. He similarly indicates that "La plupart de nos Musiciens ont du moins fait leurs preuves," *Ibid.*, 1529, which Rousseau has failed to do. As explored in Chapter 4, this failure may in fact be more to blame on the *coin du roi* itself than Rousseau, but it nevertheless points to the thinker's flawed *ethos*.

⁵⁴ This quality differentiates music from painting but also from obvious parallel forms such as theater, which lacks this ability to form a cohesive unit. While opera does have characters, the musical language employed both builds-in layering that allows for always maintaining the principles of eloquence, and creates a permanent substrate that is the voice of its originator. The thinkers realize the uniqueness of the art and the difficulty of defining it, much as the essence of written eloquence remains somewhat elusive.

intellectualism that Kintzler contends Rousseau attacks.⁵⁵ This is very much the case in his criticisms of Rameau and French musical practices. However, Rousseau values a form of complexity in his rhetorically-based writings about music that both affords him greater opportunities to broach complex issues and allows him to make Italian music more palatable to his French reader: in its relationship with eloquence, his favored music's structural simplicity yields complex analyses (through multi-layering and cross-referencing) that pay homage to French approach in the secondary literature, where it belongs—rather than the primary, which is to say the music itself.

Authors like Rousseau who seek to frame the discussion according to their designs often use footnotes as one of the ways to accomplish this level of complexity.⁵⁶ While footnotes may go virtually unnoticed by the casual reader, they often contain indications for the most serious participants on how the debate is to be structured, as well as the way in which it is to be understood. For example, in a footnote to the passage of his *Lettre sur la musique française* on Italy's entanglement with France, Rousseau takes the author from the turn of the century who most influenced his aesthetic theories—a fellow partisan of the Ancients who died a decade earlier, the Abbé Du Bos—and refutes one of his points in order to demonstrate that

... si l'harmonie n'est que la base commune et que la mélodie seule constitue le caractère, non seulement la musique moderne est née en Italie, mais il y a quelque apparence que, dans toutes nos langues vivantes, la musique italienne est la seule qui puisse réellement exister. Du temps d'Orlande et de Goudimel, on faisait de l'harmonie et des sons; Lully y a

⁵⁵ Kintzler, *Poétique de l'opéra français: de Corneille à Rousseau*, 52.

⁵⁶ Although Rousseau is known for doing this throughout his corpus, the practice of using footnotes as a way of transferring eloquence to the written form, as we will further explore, is widespread in the *querelle*'s texts.

joint un peu de cadence; Corelli, Buononcini, Vinci et Pergolèse sont les premiers qui aient fait de la musique.⁵⁷

Such a statement is interesting on several levels. To begin, this passage constitutes a slight concession on the part of an author who rarely gives harmony any real weight: while disguised as *only* being the bass element, harmony is nevertheless clearly granted an important role, as long as melody remains the predominant guide. Rousseau seems to be drawing a parallel between harmony being necessary yet also responsible for the dark side of music, and Italian music's having gone through bad times before eventually resulting in its present ideal form. Another point of interest is evident in the wording employed, which carefully avoids targeting sacred music. Clearly, Rousseau is only interested in *langues vivantes* and the operatic form; thus, every effort is made to ensure the debate stays squarely organized around these axes. Finally, the remarks are contained within the ancillary form of a footnote, whose position as such and length indicate it is intended for the most serious of readers. Since harmony is decidedly evil for Rousseau and the passage part of a footnote, the attentive reader understands that the author is calling for careful decoding of his text as a whole with a particular focus on the footnotes. The latter are effectively hidden within plain sight. Like the roadmap found in Rousseau's footnotes, music that relies too much on harmony could be a warning to the good orator: just as purely harmonic sounds may have the power to move,⁵⁸ rhetoric that overuses technique and flourish may be able to persuade but it also loses its all-important moral aspect. Once again, the two sides disagree in the final analysis but share a common framework that is built on an agreement

⁵⁷ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 162.

⁵⁸ See Rousseau's example of military music, based on past thinkers' observations of the phenomenon, in the *Examen de deux principes de Monsieur Rameau*, written the year following the *bouffons'* departure.

concerning both eloquence and music: while harmony provides the foundations of music and is therefore vital at all times for Rameau, it is viewed as detracting from music's essence by Rousseau—save for certain specific instances of accompaniment we will delve into later—and therefore serves as a mask that makes palatable bad music. This inauthentic quality is tantamount to bad rhetoric, which may be able to seduce through skillful use of technique but is founded on immoral principles. The opposition of essential and abused technical aspects of rhetoric is further examined in Chapter 4, but we can already see that it exists—in both content and structure—within the principles of eloquence, as well as those of musical composition and practice.

One of the quarrel's central dualities agreed upon by both sides is thus the concurrent need for clarity and deep reflection. In addition to contributing to the principle of education, as noted earlier, the notion takes on the form of an exploration of multiple areas of investigation and a presentation of competing theories thanks to the apparent simplicity of the musical topic. It is no surprise that the *coin de la reine* is particularly vocal in calling for simplicity as a means of providing clarity. However, the idea is certainly used by the *coin du roi* as a point of attack. Thinkers repeatedly accuse Rousseau of engaging in mere “sophismes,”⁵⁹ indicating that his ideal of simplicity has effectively led to oversimplification and the construction of arguments devoid of any real substance. As noted previously, for the *coin du roi*, simplicity comes not from what it sees as oversimplification but from clear, organized structure. Thus, Laugier—a Jesuit and the future co-editor of the first French musicological review, whose 1753 *Essai sur*

⁵⁹ For instance, in his *Apologie de la Musique et des Musiciens Français, Contre les assertions peu mélodieuses, peu mesurées et mal fondées du Sieur Jean-Jacques Rousseau, ci-devant Citoyen de Genève*, René de Bonneval repeatedly uses the term to point to the *Lettre sur la musique française*'s overly-elemental nature. Similarly, Morand and Estève in their *Justification de la musique française*, in *QB*, 1089, allude to Rousseau by simply referring to “certains Sophistes.”

l'architecture happens to call for rational simplicity in construction—claims he will “mettre de l’ordre et de la clarté dans la discussion,”⁶⁰ implying that Rousseau’s arguments are convoluted and unclear. This thought is further developed by Fréron, who turns Rousseau’s veiled argumentative statements into a mere excuse that hides his deficiencies: “une bonne définition eût éclairci la matière et décidé la question. Mais il aime mieux s’escrimer dans l’obscurité,”⁶¹ he writes. This is a way of indicating that voluntary obscurity must have the proper motivation, which is to build rich content, not hide the imprecision of one’s arguments. So, the two sides agree that complexity should not be a feature of their arguments’ content but that it should exist as a structural component that allows for multilayered, yet clear, lines of argumentation.

Just as he favors apparent simplicity in music, within his own writings Rousseau plays with his version of the *clair-obscur*. In true rhetorical fashion, while incorporating clues to satisfy the advanced reader, Rousseau acknowledges the importance reaching those who may not have undertaken the archaeological work necessary to getting the most from the text. To reach the largest possible audience, as mandated by the rules of good rhetoric, Rousseau makes explicit what had been concealed.⁶² Clearly, Rousseau believes this less clued-in section of his audience to be made up of those on the side of French music, because he uses terms that are intended to directly appeal to them, such as “règle de l’unité” (a version of his previous terminology even more explicitly linked to French classical theatre) and “goût.”⁶³ His conclusion supports what the careful reader will have already uncovered, as recently as in the previous paragraph: “appeler

⁶⁰ Laugier, *Apologie de la Musique Française contre M. Rousseau*, in *QB*, 1151.

⁶¹ Fréron, *Lettres sur la musique française*, in *QB*, 776.

⁶² Up until this point, Rousseau’s arguments concerning harmony necessitate a certain interpretative reading, although careful analysis does lead to the conclusions that are then made explicit.

⁶³ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 161. Surely, this point is not lost on the careful reader, who can see an extra level within this very indication that gives him yet another reason to choose the *coin de la reine*.

tout ce chaos de la musique, c'est insulter également l'oreille et le jugement des auditeurs,"⁶⁴ meaning that Rameau's harmonic complexities (and, for Rousseau, true polyphony) necessarily result in disorder. By appealing to his reader's judgment, Rousseau is alluding not only to the notion of *raison* that was so important to French thought in the previous century—and to the current notion of *bon goût* that derives from it—but also to the rhetorical nature of his own discourse, as used in a judicial setting: he is asking the reader to prepare himself to play the role of judge.

So, music for Rousseau, like a good argument, can and should therefore have multiple levels: in its written form, it must contain multiple levels, while achieving simplicity and accessibility for a wide audience. The difficulty naturally lies in bridging these incongruous aspirations, which seem far better suited to a form that embraces harmony than one that relies on melody and avowed simplicity. However, for Rousseau, it is overarching simplicity (his concept of "unité de mélodie") that precisely allows a reconciliation of these objectives. His opponents are well aware of this and find that Rousseau's purported simplicity fails to achieve this goal of accessibility. For instance, Jourdan notes that "L'Opéra n'est-il fait que pour ces Messieurs et leurs Spectateurs, seront-ils les seuls à prendre du plaisir,"⁶⁵ pointing to a form of selfishness in the other side's proclaimed leadership that has real consequences: by failing to embody a true aspiration to appeal to the French audience, it cannot really understand the latter. However, Rousseau works to depict Italian music as far more wide-reaching than its French counterpart, and the need for simplicity is a recurrent tool in his arsenal. Not only does French *musique*

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

⁶⁵ Jourdan, *Seconde Lettre du correcteur des bouffons à l'écolier de Prague, contenant quelques observations sur l'opéra de Tiron, le Jaloux corrigé, et Le Devin du village*, in *QB*, 574.

savante create unnecessary barriers for the listener, it camouflages the lack of any real quality in the music. “Faire briller le savoir” is the exact opposite and is a clear refutation of Rameau’s mathematically- and science-based theories. It is also a reversal of the philosopher’s idea that simplicity can lead to greater complexity and, in essence, amounts to putting the cart before the horse. For Rousseau, composers such as Rameau conceal their lack of any real talent in the complexity of their compositions—just as bad orators hide the weakness or even non-existence of arguments in flourishes of technique, much as Rousseau is himself accused of doing by the *coin du roi*—and the “fatigue” experienced in writing such works seems to translate into the sentiment experienced by the listener. Perhaps because of this mix of an attack on his nemesis and a defense of his core principles, Rousseau’s conclusion is particularly ferocious:

Tout cela n’aboutissant qu’à faire du bruit, ainsi que la plupart de nos chœurs si admirés, est également indigne d’occuper la plume d’un homme de génie et l’attention d’un homme de goût. A l’égard des contre-fugues, doubles fugues, fugues renversées, basses contraintes, et autres sottises difficiles que l’oreille ne peut souffrir et que la raison ne peut justifier, ce sont évidemment des restes de barbarie et de mauvais goût qui ne subsistent, comme les portails de nos églises gothiques, que pour la honte de ceux qui ont eu la patience de les faire.⁶⁶

Once again using one of his signature techniques, Rousseau appeals to characteristically French attributes in making his argument. By combining his own version of the notion of “génie,” which alludes to—without explicitly stating—its location in nature, with “goût” and “raison,” Rousseau confirms his awareness of having to deal with the still palpable presence of French classicism. Including notions dear to the classicists is a small and wilting olive branch in this instance, as the

⁶⁶ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 162.

sentiment expressed seems to be that *even a French classicist* could not justify Rameau's compositional massacres. Looking beyond the force of the attack, and delving into a multilayered reading, a number of interesting choices are revealed. First, Rousseau couples two key rhetorical notions—*ingenium* (“un homme de génie”) and *judicium* (“un homme de goût”)—to create a modern-day ideal that is in fact based on Ancient precepts. This positions the thinker or creator at the source of eloquent discourse or music but also gives commentators the very important role of deciding in favor of a given argument. The careful reader therefore understands the seriousness of his task and, while the two roles are mostly based on natural talent, they contain an element of education and erudition, which defines the public as not necessarily specialized but scholarly and thus detaining the *judicium* necessary for their task. (Rousseau unsurprisingly counts himself and a number of other scholars as their incarnation, indicating that certain particularly-skilled participants may alternate between the two categories.) He then proceeds to frame his cruel attack as a mirror of the *grand siècle*, employing a vocabulary (“barbarie,” “mauvais goût”) that could be drawn straight out of seventeenth-century writings on music. The force of his assault is therefore intensified in its simultaneous illustration through the choice of a writing style that embodies French classicism, while paying homage to the *grand siècle* and reducing it to mere savagery. This helps explain the slightly puzzling idea that unnaturally-complex music is born out of unnecessary patience, which—in addition to calling for reflection on the part of the reader as to his role—can be inversely read to indicate that listening to such labored music requires equally unnatural levels of patience. Clearly the opposite side is deeply mistaken as to its source of *ingenium*, which both results in poor music and in an inability to exercise *judicium*.

Such layering is engaged in fully by both *coins* but, as we have seen, is mainly theorized by the partisans of Italian music.⁶⁷ This allows them to encourage and enter into rich debate, while maintaining the façade of simplicity that is so important to their perception of Italian music and their very worldview. The result is part of what links music and eloquence so tightly together, serving as a guide to both participants in and readers of the quarrel. This notion that the reading and listening public plays a vital role also starts to form and will grow into an essential aspect of the quarrel.⁶⁸

In the experimental lab: comparisons of French and Italian music

The reading public as the best possible judge of the quarrel is a notion partly born from the rhetorical conceptions of fairness and morality that are key to both sides. Obviously, giving the public the status of judge is the fairest and most moral solution but the move is also part of the two *coins*' common aim of persuasion. It is thus through a valuing of *logos* (fairness being best represented by logic) and *ethos* (which is crucial to the participants not only because of moral imperatives but also because it provides them with their needed authority—their ticket not only to be in attendance but to lead others) that the quarrel's leaders are able to achieve the core

⁶⁷ One of the reasons for the *coin du roi*'s resistance to overtly endorsing this approach is that this might be construed as validating Rousseau's frequent adjustments to the content of his arguments. For the *coin du roi*, changing one's mind in this fashion is not allowed, as noted by Jourdan: "On permet à un Bel Esprit d'être inconséquent, mais c'est un ridicule dans des Philosophes," he writes in his *Seconde Lettre du Correcteur des bouffons*, in *QB*, 578. The *coin de la reine* disagrees, taking the philosophical stance that if a line of argumentation or a theory is sound, its content is almost inconsequential. This willingness on the part of Rousseau to adapt and modify his arguments is perplexing and offensive to thinkers such as Jourdan. It reflects the greater adaptability of the *coin de la reine*, both in terms of music and eloquence, further confirming the link of these two disciplines.

⁶⁸ Both sides repeatedly posit the public as the arbiter of taste and final judge. Often, this seems to signify the part of society educated in letters. However, at other times, the term takes on a wider sense, as in the letter by "Madame Folio:" "Que la voix du Public est la voix de la vérité, aussi le Guerrier et l'Homme de Lettre l'a toujours craint et respecté, parce que lui seul a le droit incontestable de décider quelles sont les actions et les écrits qui méritent l'héroïsme et l'immortalité....," *Ce qu'on a voulu dire, Réponse de Madame Folio, à la Lettre de Monsieur ****, in *QB*, 458.

arguments they believe lead to persuasion. As we will see in the next chapter, for the *coin de la reine*, this is primarily the role of the third technical proof, *pathos*, while for the *coin du roi*, the solution lies in *decorum*. Similarly, *logos* and *ethos* result in considerations about the quarrel's form, leading thinkers from both sides to suggest that an approach of comparing and contrasting would be fairest solution. In both *coins*, the thinkers come to the conclusion that this approach is near-impossible because of the differences of the two forms (*opéras bouffons* and *tragédies lyriques*) being compared, but the *coin de la reine* nevertheless engages in some experiments. For the partisans of Italian music, there is a tendency to use comparison⁶⁹ as the most convincing and most defensible form of proof that its side is right. Such efforts even include a certain level of compromise in the quarrel's opening stages.

In this vein, D'Alembert engages in some experiments that make a meager attempt to find common ground. His measured views show not only the superiority of the Italian style but also how French recitative⁷⁰ can be improved through an application to it of Italian methods. So, in *De la Liberté de la musique*, D'Alembert discusses how singing French music in the Italian style can in fact make it enjoyable, and goes on to offer his idea as a test of good recitative: singing music like declamation—which, for him, means in the Italian style—determines whether a piece is worthy of being called true music. If the music cannot survive this adaptation, the composer did not create a good recitative. This is a rare instance where one of the quarrelers is really delving into musical matters, trying to solve the dilemma. D'Alembert then offers proof in

⁶⁹ Even though it is acknowledged as flawed, the role of comparison is no doubt valued in part because of the quarrel's heritage. The previous discussions of Italian and French music had relied on this to a great extent, as seen with the exchanges between Le Cerf de la Viéville and Raguenet fifty years prior.

⁷⁰ See Chapter 2 for an examination of the *coins'* different approaches to recitative, and p. 27 for a brief explanation of its importance in the debate.

that the two least-bad verses from the *Armide* monologue chosen by Rousseau are indeed those that are the best sung in this fashion.⁷¹ Of course, Rousseau disagrees that any such possibility exists and remains resolute in his belief that clear sides must be drawn, leaving no room for such conciliations. Following his purported experiments, and once the quarrel's sides have been fully formed, D'Alembert will reach a similar position, concluding for instance that, despite his best efforts, Lully's music was poor.⁷²

In forming his rejection of the compromises suggested by others in his *coin*, Rousseau purports to have accomplished what Diderot suggests as the fairest solution to the quarrel, which is to examine side-by-side two archetypal pieces of music from each genre in as systematic and unbiased a manner as possible, which is to say once again relying *judicium's* basis in *ethos* and *logos*. However, under the pretense of fair comparison, Rousseau does something strange: in his examination of two “airs également estimés chacun dans son genre,” he claims to have proceeded “[en] les dépouillant les uns de leurs ports-de-voix et de leurs cadences éternelles, les autres des notes sous-entendues que le compositeur ne se donne point la peine d’écrire, et dont il se remet à l’intelligence du chanteur.”⁷³ For today's reader, Rousseau's endeavor is rather extraordinary in its stated removal of what he views as written embellishments (such as those “cadences” he deems trivial to the music's essence) on the one hand and unwritten, invisible ones (the concept of “sous-entendu” that is so evident to French performers and concert-goers alike that it is effectively an integral part of French music's conception, perception and performance) on the other. In fact, this presentation would have surprised Rousseau's

⁷¹ D'Alembert, *De la Liberté de la musique*, in *QB*, 2254.

⁷² Lully is portrayed as having tried his best but nothing could save his fundamentally-flawed music, which was “froide,” without the basic “chaleur” necessary to make anything good of it, *Ibid.*, 2257.

⁷³ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 152.

contemporaries, even though the two elements are being posited as possibly superfluous or at least of a similar nature. Rousseau clearly anticipated that the oddity of this idea—which, to the full credit of its conceiver’s rhetorical talent, mutilates French music but basically removes no actual notes on the Italian side, since the eradicated elements (both in terms of musical composition and performance practices) are precisely those that are uniquely French, and their non-existence part of what defines Italian simplicity—would strike his reader, for he justifies it in a footnote:

C’est donner toute la faveur à la musique française que de s’y prendre ainsi; car ces notes sous-entendues dans l’italienne ne sont pas moins de l’essence de la mélodie que celles qui sont sur le papier. Il s’agit moins de ce qui est écrit que de ce qui doit se chanter, et cette manière de noter doit seulement passer pour une sorte d’abréviation, au lieu que les cadences et les ports-de-voix du chant français sont bien, si l’on veut, exigés par le goût, mais ne constituent point la mélodie et ne sont pas de son essence: c’est pour elle une sorte de fard qui couvre sa laideur sans la détruire, et qui ne la rend que plus ridicule aux oreilles sensibles.⁷⁴

The second part of the footnote is to be expected given Rousseau’s position, as it represents everything he sees as artificial, superficial, pedantic and unpleasing about French music. We will see in Chapter 4 how the removal of such ornamental aspects forms a point of agreement between the *coins* on how eloquence is achieved, if what precisely constitutes the ornamental is disputed. In this particular instance, Rousseau defines what is required (“exigé”) of French music—what opposes it to Italian music—as the source of all its problems. Thus, Rousseau attacks France’s “goût”—*bon goût* being a matter of honor and pride for its citizens, and the

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*

“bon” consistently finding itself removed (or replaced by “mauvais” in the more aggressive passages, as seen earlier) in Rousseau’s writings, a clear indication that the French side does not deserve such an appellation—but does so parenthetically and by indicating that the French are *not* mistaken in seeing the criticized elements as appealing. Rather, the latter simply cover up the true music that may have once existed (but probably did not) hidden beneath, and has become completely destroyed by these extraneous elements. In effect, although French *ingenium* is deeply flawed, it is perfectly appropriate within its own, deeply flawed, sphere. The second revelatory element in Rousseau’s justification for the removal of French musical features is that the latter render the music ridiculous to “oreilles sensibles,” which are naturally those of the *coin de la reine*. Or are they? Taking into account the idea that music for Rousseau is the symbol of something greater,⁷⁵ these ears belong to anyone willing to truly listen. So, although he avidly works to dispel the Cartesian sources of Rameau’s theories, Rousseau is closer to the composer than he is willing to openly admit. While music boils down to harmony and a science-based model for Rameau and melody derived from a theory of language for Rousseau, the two thinkers both wish to uncover the roots of music and acknowledge it possesses something more than what is immediately heard. Many of Rousseau’s writings attack the need to be aware of a whole system in order to appreciate French music but statements such as the ones concerning “oreilles sensibles” or “l’intelligence du chanteur” are indicative of something not entirely dissimilar in Rameau’s theoretical approach.

Perhaps aware of this, Rousseau works to distance himself from the other side by questioning its use of *judicium*. Citing “l’incompétence du jugement” caused by French

⁷⁵ In particular, see Kintzler, *Poétique de l’opéra français de Corneille à Rousseau*, in which the entire aesthetic of French Classicism, as embodied in French opera, is shown to be questioned.

musicians' inability to follow musical measure (the only such phenomenon throughout Europe), Rousseau puts into effect his version of ideal comparison, which results in "un grand nombre d'essais" before being able to establish "un jugement raisonnable."⁷⁶ His following two "expériences" of comparison are closer to resembling the scientific kind in that they are not merely theoretical and involve supposedly having observed phenomena *in situ*, allowing them to take their natural course. One cannot but notice that Rousseau seems to forget his own advice concerning the establishment of foreseeable variables prior to execution—but this is of little import, since his goal is rhetorical, rather than evidentiary. The main contention in these purported experiments is that Italian music is more naturally executable and likeable than its French counterpart, and the evidence precisely lies in *judicium*. In the case of the Armenian of Venice,⁷⁷ the discovery of a man who—despite being intelligent and curious—has somehow managed to go his entire life without ever having heard a note of music, is a phenomenon equivalent to travelling to a far-off land and coming face to face with its natives. Much as the seventeenth-century Jesuits reported in the wake of their voyages to America concerning the power of music to seduce the Amerindians, Rousseau claims that once the Armenian gentleman has been exposed to Italian music (farcically executed by a Frenchman, an amateur of "M. Rameau" to boot, marking the first time the latter is named in Rousseau's *Lettre* and positioning the performance as decidedly subpar), he experiences "un ravissement sensible" and "Dès ce

⁷⁶ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 154.

⁷⁷ It is interestingly a decade following the quarrel that Rousseau adopts his famous Armenian costume. Although he wears it for health reasons and as the result of an encounter with an Armenian tailor at Motiers-Travers (see Rousseau, *Les Confessions*, in *Œuvres*, 316-317, in which the author explains his gradual adopting of the garb was clenching when George Keith, Prussian Field Marshall for Frederick II and Rousseau's protector and friend, signaled his approval with the Armenian greeting "Salamaleki"), Rousseau's fondness for the costume seems to form some sort of reference to this key moment of the *querelle*. At the very least, it expresses a certain appreciation of Armenian culture and helps elucidate the seemingly random selection of his protagonist.

moment on ne put plus lui faire écouter aucun air français.”⁷⁸ What greater proof of nature’s preference for Italian music could there be than the un-spoilt subject’s complete enlightenment through the said music? This is the exercise of *judicium* in its most natural, unadulterated state, by a listener who is highly educated and qualified to pass judgment but has none of the biases of his contemporaries. Unlike the Jesuits, however, Rousseau’s induction of the Armenian is made without any sort of religious framework and this begs the question of what underlying structure, if any, might be present. Since the subject lives in Venice, one supposes he understands Italian and, being “homme d’esprit,” he is able to grasp the importance of the words being set to music. However, Rousseau’s point concerns the closeness of Italian music to nature and its resulting force, which produces a conscious choice to favor Italian music over its French counterpart. The main point is therefore related to music’s eloquence. It is as if Italian music’s own innate *ingenium* affects the listener’s *judicium*, demonstrating its superior use of the technical proofs, even in the absence of the traditional prior exposure to the form, and concurrently revealing the superficiality of French music.

So, Italian music is objectively preferable, but Rousseau does not forget that eloquence and music both rely on aspects that go beyond this to affect *judicium*—that *pathos* is at least as important as *logos* and *ethos*. By citing the pride taken by the French in the difficulty of their music and indicating that this really means “les Italiens ont une mélodie et nous n’en avons point,”⁷⁹ Rousseau attacks the essence of French music and the intellectual pleasure associated with it: valuing *logos* at the detriment of the other proofs cannot result in effective music.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 155.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 154. The statement’s importance is supported by its placement in a footnote, as we will see in the section on textual multi-layering. This also is a demonstration of how to properly integrate a level for advanced readers: such content must be separate from what is offered to the masses, so as not overwhelm the latter.

Eloquent music naturally favors the Italian style: the listener must first be marked by the beauty of song (achieving *delectare*), derived from its association with language, before going on to explore any other aspects of the art.⁸⁰ What makes this even more specifically about eloquence is that the ultimate aim of rhetoric—persuasion—is also in play here: returning to the Armenian of Venice, once good music has been heard, it speaks to the soul (through the “*ravissement sensible*”) in the way a good orator would, and no other type of music (or argument) is convincing any longer. Following the full effect *pathos*, supported by *logos* and *ethos* but these two complementing rather than supplanting the former, *judicium* is then used by the listener to reach only one possible outcome. As Rousseau notes, those who embrace Italian music “n’aiment que la véritable musique,”⁸¹ which is to say eloquent music. The concrete result of Italian music’s persuasive force is the very act of this selection.

If the *coin du roi* does not offer a fully developed theory of comparison intended to counteract Rousseau’s, it does willingly take on its defense by using similar arguments and through point-by-point responses to Rousseau’s attacks. Although these counter-attacks mostly serve little purpose beyond contradicting Rousseau, some are reformulated versions of his own theories, turned on their head to show how Italian music’s instantaneous gratification is in fact a sign of superficiality. Thus, when Castel—a noted Cartesian thinker, as indicated previously—admits that the Italian style is natural, bountiful, and confident, without any hesitation, it is only to contrast these apparent qualities with the learned and *logos*-based aspects of French music,⁸²

⁸⁰ This depiction of music closely resembles the manner in which a rhetorical discourse must draw in the widest possible array of audience members by pleasing them, before moving on to its other goals.

⁸¹ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 155.

⁸² Castel, *Réponse critique d’un académicien de Rouen, à l’académicien de Bordeaux, sur le plus profond de la musique*, in *QB*, 1468.

which attest to its greater depth. Similarly, what may be seen as hesitant, timid or even slow is in fact a sign of thoughtfulness and positive gravity, as well as of the lack of these qualities on the other side. In this sense, the absence of a real counter-theory is indicative of the futility of mere comparison or its misplacement as applied to musical content, leading to statements such as “Je crois que c’est des Italiens qu’on peut dire, *comparaison n’est pas raison*.”⁸³ Such responses are particularly biting in their use of old French sayings that remind the reader of the importance of deep reflection born from previous generations. They call for something beyond a simple contrasting of the two musical styles.⁸⁴ The elaboration of such perspectives enables the *coin du roi* to engage in comparison without ever endorsing the approach, at least as applied to musical analysis. It also allows the partisans of French music to extrapolate from previous debates—including the quarrel of the Ancients and Moderns—an opposition of *philosophes* pitted against non-*philosophes* or even anti-*philosophes*, as seen in the next section.

II. Team-building through music

The fundamental rhetorical preconception that teams must be chosen to effectively settle a question is one of the *querelle des bouffons*’ undercurrents and, while this is true of most rhetorical debates, less waffling is permitted in this instance, as far as maintaining an allegiance throughout the debate is concerned. However, the range of discussion topics is particularly ambitious, which gives the quarrelers a certain flexibility in terms of their theoretical output.

Dualities of all sorts, sharp oppositions and the application of the deliberative and judicial genres

⁸³ Voisenon or Pindensat de Mairobert, *Réponse du coin du roi au coin de la reine*, in *QB*, 270.

⁸⁴ The side-by-side comparison of musical compositions is one of the rare instances in which the *coin du roi* calls for greater violence, often through appeals to the reader’s patriotism. This reveals just how important a position was held by music as an entity (rather than merely a tool of comparison) and within French culture as a whole, as well as the centrality of the debate being elsewhere than in a comparison of strict musical forms.

therefore abound in order to provide clarity, make sense of the diverse areas of investigation, and avoid the pitfall of never settling anything through attempts to be diplomatic.⁸⁵ So, continuing the debate over the respective merits of French and Italian musical styles is at the very least convenient: familiar to French thinkers and having already elicited strong emotions, the issue has been broached but never explored to the extent that it is with the *querelle des bouffons*. From a purely practical standpoint, music serves as a rhetorical tool that allows participants to form clear-cut *coins* based, at least in part, on a musical preference, without the sort of artificiality that sometimes exists at the onset. This division into camps—with partakers taking turns at disproving their opponents by embracing the crucial role of “contradictor,” as described by Marc Fumaroli in *L’Âge de l’éloquence*, but also always remembering the importance of interacting with their adversaries on the questions that go beyond the main structure of oppositions, thus taking the idea of an interlocutor and using it not only with their readers but also with each other as writers, within their examination of the fertile subset of issues that are explored—is emphasized by historical facts, such as the musical representations that form the very basis of the debate: Italian operas have reached the height of popularity during the quarrel, and Rameau experiences his greatest success (in terms of the number of representations of his operas) in 1754.⁸⁶ This is a way of both reacting to and furthering the debate: within the *querelle*’s rhetorical frame, criticism and contradiction are vital components that generate passion and engagement among the participants and allow for a dissimulated exploration of more subtle issues. This strong division into two corners also provides a synthesis or union—the humanistic

⁸⁵ In fact, a reverse problem seems to arise: participants are so fully engaged in lively debate that they sometimes get hung up on personal points of contention, drawing fire from their adversaries for failing to see the larger picture.

⁸⁶ Boissou, “*Platée* de Rameau à l’avant-garde d’une évolution du goût,” in Fabiano, *La “Querelle des Bouffons” dans la vie culturelle française du XVIIIe siècle*, 30.

commonality that is lacking in today's often too-great scholarly specialization—, helping the quarrel's thinkers arrive at a true form of multidisciplinary exchange⁸⁷ thanks to the existence of the strong overarching external oppositions valued by its rhetorical frame.

In what almost seems like an anticipated reaction to the criticism he expects to draw for the violence of his *Lettre sur la musique française*, Rousseau speaks out against moderation and conciliation. His description of “les moins prévenus d'entre-nous” is the text's first overt call to battle, hidden in a footnote (so as to solicit responses from the advanced reader, as noted earlier):

Plusieurs condamnent l'exclusion totale que les amateurs de musique donnent sans balancer à la musique française; ces modérés conciliateurs ne voudraient pas de goûts exclusifs, comme si l'amour des bonnes choses devait faire aimer les mauvaises.⁸⁸

This approach informs the reader of what is to come in the remainder of the letter and of his expected role. Specifically, in the next phase, dedicated to the aforementioned comparison of French and Italian music, the reader is asked to strongly take a side. Indeed, a *prise de position* on either side is better than disinterest or nonchalance; and, more generally, the reader expects the force of Rousseau's attacks in the rest of the letter—as well as his adversaries' subsequent responses—to increase in a no-holds-barred fashion,⁸⁹ along a variety of axes.

⁸⁷ This ideal form sought by the quarrelers is akin to what Fumaroli refers to as a utopic synthesis in *L'Âge de l'éloquence*, xviii.

⁸⁸ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 152.

⁸⁹ Rousseau is providing a sort of disclaimer that his reader can appreciate, ensuring the latter is adequately forewarned and must therefore accept the approach, based on Cicero's principle of rhetorical violence. See *Brutus*, in which rough confrontation is key and the orator must win over his listener with forceful emotions.

Varying conceptions of music as rhetoric

Before arriving at this point of impassioned battle, the parties seek to establish the criteria that should matter most in the evaluation of music's role, which will then be used to inform their perspectives on a wider range of topics. A few key principles that are agreed upon as essential but perceived by the two *coins* in fundamentally different ways bring about foundational differences on either side. In particular, Rousseau's language-based theories lead to varying notions on each side concerning which elements are essential to music and what constitutes true eloquence in music.

For the *coin de la reine*, the key to understanding the relationship between eloquence and music lies in careful analysis.⁹⁰ The central portion of the *Lettre sur la musique française* begs for such close examination, especially given Rousseau's intriguing terminology in this section, which smacks of the *unités* of *théâtre classique*:

Cette unité de mélodie me paraît une règle indispensable et non moins importante en musique que l'unité d'action dans une tragédie; car elle est fondée sur le même principe et dirigée vers le même objet. ... C'est dans cette grande règle qu'il faut chercher la cause des fréquents accompagnements à l'unisson. ... Ces unissons ne sont point praticables dans notre musique...⁹¹

Since Rousseau generally seeks to confront French classicism, his choices here are meaningful and can at least partly be explained as meeting the rhetorical criteria of adapting to and pleasing

⁹⁰ In his *Réflexions sur la musique*, in *QB*, 1646, D'Alembert explains that "Je pense qu'on n'a pas fait assez d'attention à ces moyens, et aux bornes qu'ils ont posées entre chacun de ces Arts." Through this perspective, he supports Rousseau's indication that it is the *philosophe's* role to reflect and comment on the arts. Such reflection—"l'esprit d'analyse" (1645) mentioned previously—is the key to crossing the boundaries that have been constructed.

⁹¹ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 158.

one's audience: Rousseau knows his reader, realizes that even those on his side—and without a doubt those in the opposite camp—have a natural allegiance to French traditions, and that by couching his ideas in a veil of classicism, he increases his chance of being persuasive. The passage also illustrates how music viewed as rhetoric takes the rules of French tragedy, which Catherine Kintzler shows are applied to the *tragédie lyrique*,⁹² and makes them both more relevant and broader: through the relationship of eloquence and music, French and Italian music can be judged on the same footing. The choice to refer to French theater is natural not only because of French opera's derivation from the form, but also because many rules of French tragedy were based on rhetorical principles and, in particular, breaches of *decorum*. Indeed, just as in a play, in music these result in ridicule or inappropriate (because unintentionally-provoked) laughter. This strong sense of what is appropriate for a given medium and a particular audience will be a prime motivator throughout the quarrel, especially for the *coin du roi*'s arguments in its considerations of music. Alluding to the suitability of certain musical forms (or the lack thereof) for a given music thus allows Rousseau to incorporate the notion and reinforce the Frenchness of his approach. Almost as an illustration of *decorum* in relation to both his reader and his topic, Rousseau underlines this intent through his choice of etymology: the idea of “unisson” he introduces comes from the combination of “unité” and “son,” two elements that seem French *par excellence* but form the core of the Italian style as it is perceived by the *coin de la reine*. This provides credibility to his discourse on at least a subconscious level, as well as a referential

⁹² Kintzler, *Poétique de l'opéra français: de Corneille à Rousseau*, 213. The vocabulary employed here by Rousseau, through which Italian music is described as having a “grande règle” and Rousseau's “unité de mélodie” is explicitly said to be as important for music as “l'unité d'action dans un tragédie,” is likely one of the elements that inspired Catherine Kintzler to pursue her invaluable work on French opera as *tragédie en musique* conforming to the principles of seventeenth-century theatre.

aspect that indicates more is contained in the text than is visible at first glance. This is similarly the case with Rousseau's choice of words that have double meanings, which are scattered throughout the rest of the passage in close succession: "... les instruments et la voix ne pourraient jamais **s'accorder**, et ne **marcheraient** point assez de **concert** pour produire **ensemble** un effet agréable."⁹³ By selecting overtly musical subjects in his construction ("les instruments et la voix") that can also have non-musical meanings, Rousseau provides a clue to the reverse effect that is central to the remainder of the sentence. His use of descriptive words in their non-musical function (such as "moelleux" or the ones emphasized in the citation above) combined with palpably musical terms like "unisson" and "mesure"⁹⁴ seem intended to reach a wide audience while maintaining the key position of *decorum*, confirming the idea that Rousseau intends for the debate to make good use of music's ability to extend beyond itself, all the while creating "un effet agréable"—something straight out of the musical domain but that is successful because it is appropriate—in the context of this pamphlet and therefore illustrating the strength of the relationship between eloquence and music.

The use of this last expression underlines music's primary goal of pleasing, and the depicted failures of French music remind the reader that simplicity guided by a strong melody is the means of achieving it. Similarly, Rousseau's own written eloquence incorporates a level of complexity through the aforementioned lexical elements but, above all, seeks to seduce his reader. As can be seen in the bold claims that punctuate the *Lettre*, the author also favors strong, simple ideas to guide his discourse and create a big impact. Just as in Rousseau's text, music finds itself buoyed in these primary goals by a number of supporting elements. Thus, while

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 159, my emphases.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*

harmony plays an important role, Rousseau avoids using the term in this section, both to perform a substitution in the form of the word “accompagnement” (relegating harmony to its proper position) and to avoid any possible confusion that might lead the reader to assign too great a role to harmonic structure. The role of the accompaniment—i.e. the purely musical component of an opera—is presented thusly:

Une beauté qui résulte encore de ces unissons, c’est de donner une expression plus sensible à la mélodie, tantôt en renforçant tout d’un coup les instruments sur un passage, tantôt en les radoucissant, tantôt en leur donnant un trait de chant énergique et saillant que la voix n’aurait pu faire et que l’auditeur, adroitement trompé, ne laisse pas de lui attribuer quand l’orchestre sait le faire sortir à propos.⁹⁵

Re-iterating a previous indication, Rousseau toys with the idea that instrumental music only *seems* to be a source of great impact. Since it is a combination of accompaniment, words and a vocal part that allows for music’s power—and, in this instance, with the accompaniment mirroring the vocal line (“ces unissons”)—music’s own role is important only in its correlation to language. The use of greater variation in the instrumental parts corresponds to providing variety, as well as surprise and other effects that stem from the principles of good discourse. Thus, the listener is “trompé” by a talented composer but, far from having the negative connotation sometimes associated with this word, the dissimulation is positive. Indeed, disguise or even a certain type of manipulation is a good thing in music, as long as it serves its primary rhetorical functions. Eloquence and music share the common responsibilities to please, move and teach but, perhaps out of deference to music’s traditional depiction as providing pleasure above all else, the

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*

first of these elements occupies the first position in music's quest to persuade, whereas it does not necessarily in rhetorical practice. For Quintilian, it is discourse that is intended to reach the masses—"designed to charm the multitude"—⁹⁶ that has a particular obligation to please and, while based on the deliberative style, must use the cloak of elegance to avoid being "inartistic."⁹⁷ The idea that discourse intended to reach, and persuade, the masses—what Quintilian calls "declamation," a type of eloquence whose aim is eloquence itself (rather than a more specific goal, as in forensic discourse)—must be realistic without being equivalent to ordinary conversation, using artfulness to increase its appeal, is both perfectly suited to music in general and to the Italian *opera buffa* in particular, which is based in reality but depicted as achieving the highest pinnacle of the musical form. For these reasons, while a rhetorical discourse can be successfully spoken or written in French (though not to the extent it would be in Italian, Latin or ancient Greek), music based on French text cannot be truly successful: within the perspective of music as eloquence espoused by Rousseau, the beauty of music relies almost entirely on the grace of its language, which is nonexistent as far as French is concerned and prevents French music from achieving its aims.⁹⁸

However, Quintilian's precepts also serve the *coin du roi*, in that its music too seeks to please, if it does so by using the *merveilleux*, rather than trying to stay grounded in reality. This goes towards both towards Quintilian's vision of "declamation" as theatrical and the second facet

⁹⁶ Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, Book II, Chapter X, 277.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*

⁹⁸ Therefore, as cited above, "ces unissons ne sont point praticables dans notre musique" (a specific reference, once again, to the correspondence between accompaniment and the vocal line) not only because of the division between instrumental and vocal music in France but also because the two are born directly out of the country's musically-defective native language. The conception of music as eloquence presented in this passage thus also serves to explain and even render logical Rousseau's famous conclusion (see p. 104).

of his argument, which states that this type of public discourse intended to reach the masses is in fact permitted to reveal the effort that goes into achieving elegance (whereas true deliberative style must avoid this), playing perfectly into the *coin*'s valuation of technique. This approach can be seen in the way in which the partisans of French music value language. Thus, Castel's defense of French as having plentiful words for full expression is a direct response to Rousseau's linguistically-based attack: Castel accepts one of his opponent's theories, which consists in seeking the essence of eloquence and music and minimizing their ornamental aspects, but, for the linguistic roots of music, finds this essence to be the meaning of words, rather than their sounds. There is therefore common ground in the agreement that language is crucial to both discourse and music but, while Rousseau sees its effect on the ears as vitally important to both in that it is the point of entry for the ideas being expressed, thinkers such as Castel see meaning itself as the appropriate method of seduction by which a listener or reader will become interested. This conception of language is a mirror of Rameau's vision of music and, at least theoretically, accounts for French music's particular brand of charm, as opposed to the much more widely approachable Italian style. Thus, both eloquence and music—in their united origins and common purposes—are viewed in fundamentally different ways by the two *coins* and this results in different approaches. The bond of the two fields is more clearly elemental on the Italian side, with linguistic sounds playing a more important role and corresponding more easily to musical equivalents than on the French side. For the latter, the correspondences are made through content and intellectual correlations, as reflected in the less immediate appeal of its music.

This difference in approaches is also evident in the way the quarrel's foreign element is viewed by each side, as developed in the next section. In relation to the conceptualization of

music, the *coin du roi* often posits Italian recitative⁹⁹ as bad rhetoric. Caux de Cappeval—a flautist and one of Rousseau’s most outspoken critics, whose opposition to the *Encyclopédistes* is well known—is vocal about this: “Quel récitatif encore! Il est maigre, sec, ennuyeux, dégoûtant même pour les oreilles Françaises...”¹⁰⁰ The foreign aspect of the Italian style, in its relation to the way in which French society conceptualizes and listens to music, helps explain Italian music’s essentially bad substrate in its failure to adapt itself to its intended audience upon arriving in France. Several of the fundamental principles of eloquence are thus overlooked by the Italian side: adaptation to the audience, piquing its interest and providing real substance.¹⁰¹ One senses a direct correlation between this characterization of Italian music and the *coin de la reine*’s constant reiteration of its central principle of simplicity. This difference in perception finds its source in fundamentally different conceptions of music and rhetoric as disciplines: although Rousseau and his cohorts support a certain complexity, there is nevertheless a sentiment that simplicity and reaching the widest audience are essential factors, while the *coin du roi* often favors forms of eloquence and music that elevate in a manner that requires certain keys to be understood. Thus, Caux de Cappeval’s characterization of Italian recitative as formulaic is a retort to the *coin de la reine*’s claim that French music places too great an emphasis on technique: “Dans ce Pays là, tout le monde en sait faire; il n’y a rien qu’à parler, et mettre de grosses notes à chaque phrase. Cela fait du Récitatif bien facile, mais cela ne fait pas du beau Récitatif.” His justification is that music must imitate “la belle Nature” (“belle” being key) and

⁹⁹ As seen in Chapter 2, recitative is the ultimate means of fusing music and eloquence, partly thanks to its closeness to speech.

¹⁰⁰ Caux de Cappeval, *Apologie du goût français*, in *QB*, 1565.

¹⁰¹ In this context, Caux de Cappeval’s additional comment that “leur récitatif ne vaut pas la peine qu’on en parle,” *Ibid.*, is not excessive; it is simply a reflection of poor music not adhering to rhetorical principles and thus lacking interest.

nothing else, implying that the everyday situations of *opere buffe* are too mundane, and that recitative resembling regular speech is too easy. Italian music, like its supporters' thought process, is not elevated enough in its depiction of commonplace situations and favoring of simplicity. For the French side, to achieve eloquence, music must be different from—rather than a mirror of—ordinary life. Thus, a discussion of what constitutes good music illustrates how common rhetorical principles including education, emotion and pleasure are important to both sides but viewed in very different ways.¹⁰²

A foreign affair: questions of origins

The *querelle* being inscribed in a long line of musical discussions, the agreed-upon rhetorical aims of forming distinct *coins*—in a manner that requires the partisans of either music to firmly place themselves within one of the two teams, as we saw, allowing for less movement from one side to the other than in previous quarrels—find themselves combined with a preconceived notion that music serves as a particularly apt battleground to wage war on a number of issues in an intense, yet civilized manner. This common acknowledgement that music can be a pretext is partly what allows for a crossing of boundaries or—literally—of borders. On the most basic level, this leads to the establishment of the two camps examined above: those who embrace the latest, greatest importations, and those who defend the pride of a nation. This simple division evolves into the complex quarrel that we have come to think of as emblematic of musical discussions in the Enlightenment, but the status of the foreign and of foreign perceptions

¹⁰² Along these lines, Laugier agrees with Rousseau on the three pillars of “génie musical” (melody, harmony and measure) in his *Apologie de la musique française*, in *QB*, 1154, but prioritizes and defines them according to the *coin du roi*'s ideals.

on French soil—born out of this basic duality—remains central and arises in various forms throughout the debate.

Before the quarrel proper begins, Grimm writes his famous critique of Destouche's opera *Omphale*. As noted earlier,¹⁰³ this letter must be considered part of the quarrel texts if only because of the influence it has on Rousseau and the way he in turn uses it. In his *Lettre sur Omphale*, Grimm deals very concretely with music and, more generally, with French culture as a whole. Nevertheless, it is music—and not any other domain—that provides grounds for contestation. Grimm wonders how a society so cultured and displaying such leadership in other areas can be deaf to its lacks in the musical domain. From this simple question and using the notion of *judicium*, which is the foundation of the modern perception of French *bon goût*, the refusal to recognize Italian music is presented as an uncharacteristic flaw in the French character. Thus, camps begin to form and the complexity of what will come—that is, the way in which the *querelle des bouffons* goes beyond a simple opposition of French and Italian music—begins to be seen. Part of this complication lies in the very idea of foreignness and its relation to music.

The *coin du roi* sometimes uses the foreign element in a rather straightforward fashion that opposes French and Italian or, more globally, French and non-French, and the *coin de la reine* immediately senses its disadvantage on the issue.¹⁰⁴ Its partisans must therefore find various ways to make its undeniable foreign aspect seem like more than simply appealing in its exoticism, allowing them to portray it as a fundamentally good choice for France. Thus, certain

¹⁰³ See footnote 7.

¹⁰⁴ Although it forms only a small portion of its otherwise more nuanced arguments, the instinctive ferocity sometimes found in the *coin du roi* demonstrates the natural tendency to see Italian music as an evil foreign influence. For instance, Jourdan remarks concerning the adaptation of Italian music that “J’aimerais autant qu’on proposât à toute notre Nation de parler Arabe,” *Seconde lettre du correcteur des bouffons*, in *QB*, 578.

thinkers seek to camouflage the foreign aspect as a way of making their side more palatable, while others take a more boldfaced approach. For instance, Holbach illustrates the latter through his ironic depiction of foreign taste to strongly assert the absurdities of French music's features: "Que les Etrangers qui nous accusent de légèreté, écoutent, s'ils l'osent, les productions de nos compositeurs, et qu'ils rougissent de leur calomnie."¹⁰⁵ Here, the term "Etrangers" is used to show the close-mindedness of the French perspective, as well as reveal the intelligence of foreign perspectives, leading to the idea of music as a gateway to other topics. Holbach is unapologetic in his beliefs because he sees French music as so degraded that being un-French becomes a matter of pride, just as does the "légèreté" so criticized by his opponents—when this lightness is opposed to French music's oppressiveness.

D'Alembert favors a sort of middle ground by showing how foreign influence has been integrated into French culture over the years and demonstrating that Italian music is in fact a far better addition than those previously made. Through humor, he points out the bad taste of the French on many levels (such as the *chinoiseries* in their homes),¹⁰⁶ and is brought to wonder how their ears can possibly be hurt by Italian music. This argument implies that French offense at Italian music actually proves the latter is good. D'Alembert's way of dealing with his side's foreignness is therefore to show that the French seem to embrace only bad foreign elements, while rejecting the good ones. This is echoed by Grimm, who refers to Lully simply as "le Florentin"¹⁰⁷ and notes that his terrible recitative was not his own invention but an adaptation of the worst of what German music has to offer, almost rendering moot the question of French and

¹⁰⁵ Holbach, *Lettre à une dame d'un certain âge*, in *QB*, 126.

¹⁰⁶ D'Alembert, *De la Liberté de la musique*, in *QB*, 2219.

¹⁰⁷ Grimm, *Le Petit Prophète de Boehmischbroda*, in *QB*, 167.

non-French. In stark opposition to French obstinacy and poor taste, the rest of Europe willingly embraces all that is best from beyond its borders. More to the point, Europe has adopted French theater as its own, proving itself fair in judgment, and has not disavowed the French language in its universal embrace Italian opera. Its rejection of French opera is therefore unbiased. Frédéric II of Prussia—a well-known supporter of the Enlightenment, who would go on to become Rousseau’s protector a decade following the *querelle*, and made figures such as Diderot, Voltaire and Montesquieu members of the Berlin Academy of Science—confirms this in his *Lettre au public*, which strongly supports the *coin de la reine* and concludes by demonstrating the close-mindedness and intransigence that is incarnated by the common resistance to anything foreign.¹⁰⁸

Beyond the light, humorous techniques and sometimes-simplistic arguments employed by D’Alembert and others, the thinkers of the *coin de la reine* also use their own foreignness to promote their corner in various ways. Rousseau generally plays up his appurtenance to France, presenting his perspectives as French, despite his own foreignness.¹⁰⁹ For this attempt to depict his views as representative of France, he draws repeated and sharp criticisms. The most pointed of these repeated rebuttals comes from Fréron, who remarks that “L”Auteur dit toujours, *nous, notre Langue, notre Musique*; ce qui capable d’induire en erreur les Etrangers et nos

¹⁰⁸ Frédéric II de Prusse, *Lettre au public par sa majesté le roi de Prusse*, in *QB*, 630: “nous poussons jusqu’au scrupule les attestations qu’on doit aux Puissances étrangères, et jamais on ne souffrira ici que qui que ce soit leur manque de respect.”

¹⁰⁹ This is mostly evident in his *Lettre sur la musique française*. However, in his *Lettre d’un symphoniste*, in *QB*, 653, published a couple of months prior, Rousseau is even more explicit on the question of foreignness, noting that “il ne nous a pas été difficile d’écraser de pauvres Etrangers, qui ignorant les mystères de la boutique, n’avaient d’autres protecteurs que leurs talents.” Sensing that the foreign element will be a recurrent theme and having noted that the *coin du roi* has begun using French pride to full advantage, Rousseau has his French author depict foreignness as a sort of unfair victimization and something that should not be taken into account when judging intellectual or artistic production.

descendants.”¹¹⁰ Clearly, Rousseau is purposefully misleading his reader, while giving himself an illegitimate sense of authority—a misuse of eloquence that goes against the vision of *decorum* so important to the French side. In response to Rousseau’s clever attempts to include himself among the French, Rulhière proceeds to operate an exact reversal of this technique: by referring to his opponents as “faux connaisseurs [qui] ne décident rien dans **leurs** disputes” and describing “**leurs** querelles”¹¹¹ a few lines later, the real meaning of Rousseau’s “nous et nôtre”¹¹² takes on a new light and places the *coin de la reine*—and, indeed the *philosophes* (or “faux connaisseurs”)—in an isolated position of interference from outside the boundaries of what it means to be French. This idea is amplified further in that Rousseau is always somewhat apart from the *philosophes*, even before his dispute with Diderot: in a sense, the *philosophes* are out of touch and are led in the quarrel by someone who is yet one more step removed, both in his status as a foreigner and in the eccentricity of his theories. This is bad enough in and of itself—and the *coin du roi* clearly plays up the idea that its opponents are more concerned about debates internal to their own side than the topic of the *querelle*—but Rousseau’s attempts to be representative of French thought only serve to emphasize the perception that he is meddling in areas that are in fact not within his domain.

¹¹⁰ Fréron, *Lettres sur la musique française*, in *QB*, 793. The instances of *coin du roi* authors drawing attention to Rousseau’s status as a foreigner are numerous and it is similarly noted by Caux de Cappeval, Morand and Estève, and Travenol that he is not fooling anyone by using “nous et nôtre” in order to portray himself as French. Such detailed stylistic analyses are supplemented by constant reminders of the *coin de la reine*’s foreignness. In addition to simple allusions to his Swiss origins, Rousseau’s opponents enjoy discussing his foreignness through clever wordplay or descriptions such as Morand and Estève’s in *Justification de la Musique Française*, in *QB*, 1082, which presents the philosopher as doubly-foreign by noting he is “Allobroge d’origine” in one sentence and referring to him as “Ce pauvre Genevois” in the next. The emphasis on what it means to be foreign is also underscored, with the unusual adjectival addition of “pauvre” that presents Rousseau as both disadvantaged and weak in his predetermined position of non-French.

¹¹¹ Rulhière, *Jugement de l’orchestre de l’opéra*, in *QB*, 441, my emphases.

¹¹² See footnote 110, above.

Perhaps sensing this is one of the reasons that his colleague is so frequently attacked for being Swiss, Grimm uses a different approach in his *Lettre sur Omphale*, underscoring his status as a foreigner to demonstrate the absurdity of French music. In effect, he positions himself as the very illustration of what Rousseau indicates any non-French person would feel, finding the French singing style to be absurd and unnatural—flaws that further underline the link between music and eloquence. What the French refer to as “chanter” is “ce qu’on appelle chez nous *crier*,”¹¹³ or a form rendered ineffective and inappropriate in its poor application of the rhetorical principle of *decorum*.¹¹⁴ Nevertheless, Grimm then goes on to position himself firmly on the side of the French, attesting to the “noble confiance de ce Peuple:”

L’intérêt des arts, du goût, et surtout de la Nation, demande qu’on y puisse toujours dire la vérité; et c’est une des gloires que la France seule parmi tous les Peuples d’Europe, que tout Etranger peut parler librement dans son sein, même pour relever les défauts qu’il y trouve.¹¹⁵

So, Grimm is at once living proof of how French music is perceived outside of France and the country’s most fervent admirer. This odd combination affirms his and the *coin de la reine*’s impartiality, since Grimm’s deep admiration for French culture informs his strong preference for its artistic production, while his foreignness allows for a fresh, unbiased consideration of its merits. Achieving such a balance in a convincing manner is not the easiest of tasks and may explain Grimm’s overt pandering to the reader. By praising the French ideal of freedom of

¹¹³ Grimm, *Lettre sur Omphale*, in *QB*, 8.

¹¹⁴ Given the centrality of a focused version of *decorum* for the *coin du roi*, it is possible to see instances in which Grimm, Rousseau and other partisans of Italian music stress *decorum* as a particular effort to appeal to the other side’s perceived stronger sense of reason (whether or not the impression is accurate), which is to say to its very pride.

¹¹⁵ Grimm, *Lettre sur Omphale*, in *QB*, 9.

expression (“ce sont nos Critiques mêmes qui font son plus bel éloge”),¹¹⁶ Grimm is cleverly preparing an expectation that his reader’s reaction be both measured and accepting, even if a disagreement continues to persist. That is to say, responses must follow the rules of proper discourse, while French music has become “foreign” to all that French culture represents precisely because it exhibits a growing number of attributes that belong to flawed rhetorical practices.

In this attempt to walk a fine line between embrace and rejection, even in his strong praise of Rameau—which again allows Grimm to show a level of impartiality—there are indications that the composer may not be as brilliant as he seems. For starters, Grimm’s veritable allegiance to Italian music is explicitly stated but hidden thanks to its location in a number of footnotes. Second, the disproportionately laudatory language used signals the possibility of intentional exaggeration, especially when juxtaposed with the indication that the supposed recipient of his letter appears to be a socially well-positioned lady and in the context of a passage devoted expressly to the *éloges* of those involved. Finally, this form of overacting is combined with the relegation of Rameau’s praise to the very end of the letter, after all the important points have been made, and the section therefore seems written out of obligation. In this light, it is almost an afterthought, especially when compared to the density and length of the central part of the letter which, as its title indicates, is focused on Destouches’ opera. There is thus an effort to both make Rameau a main character in the quarrel’s unfolding and concurrently push him into the sidelines. Though subtle, these rhetorical choices are partly what will allow Rousseau to later claim Grimm’s text as one of the quarrel’s starting points, and make the pamphlet’s author fit

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*

into his much more clear-cut divisions. In fact, expressed through musical criticism, Grimm's rhetorical choices—including his incorporation of a foreign perspective—forecast many of the themes that will become central to the *coin de la reine* as the quarrel progresses.

The importance of foreign origins also forms a recurrent theme in the *coin du roi*. It is used by some theorists to justify French music's appropriateness and even its very reason for existing. Thus, Bonneval writes that "Chaque Peuple a sa Langue, et je n'ose présumer que l'austère Philosophie du Sieur Rousseau s'étende jusqu'à faire un crime à un Chinois de ne pas parler Allemand ou Anglais..."¹¹⁷ The participation of foreigners in the quarrel—combined with the cross-boundary nature of music, one of the characteristics that both sides agree give music a special position within the arts—lead Bonneval to conclude that there is in fact a specificity to each nation's music and that, in fulfilling its rhetorical roles of pleasing and seducing, a given music must match each country's language: "je me demande s'il n'est pas plus convenable que la Musique s'assujettisse à la Langue pour flatter ceux qui la parlent..."¹¹⁸ Composers are more at ease composing in their own language and each country's talented poets write words that are as musical as possible, leading to the inevitable conclusion that each music must be in its corresponding country's language to attain greatness. Similarly, Castel repeatedly acknowledges that Italy was the first source of great music,¹¹⁹ in order to demonstrate that France was able to branch off and attain its own, uniquely-superior splendor. Fréron, too, notes that the particularity

¹¹⁷ Bonneval, *Apologie de la musique et des musiciens français*, in *QB*, 1067.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁹ In the second of the *Lettres d'un académicien de Bordeaux*, in *QB*, 1376, Castel recognizes that the Italians were first in music, with the French their "premiers élèves," pointing to the influence of the Medicis and later indicating that the Italians are masters in the arts (1388). This allows him to establish himself as unbiased, while building a case for French music as truly representative of French pride, and therefore something that cannot be attacked without simultaneously including the country's other institutions.

of the French musical form is based on a moderation that leads to a difference in the way the French public is moved, and deeply opposed to the (quasi-universal) foreign need for excess: “Non seulement les Anglais, mais les Italiens eux-mêmes, les Allemands, les Espagnols; en un mot, tous les étrangers écoutent froidement les Tragédies de *Corneille*, de *Racine* et de *Crébillon*. Il faut, pour les remuer, des ressorts bien plus puissants...”¹²⁰ Thus, the French situation is unique but in a good, if misunderstood, way that corresponds to the country’s temperament. It is deeply opposed to the *coin de la reine*’s excessiveness in both its music and its argumentation, a recurrent theme deeply linked to foreignness. Its role in Italian music as forming an opposition to the French call for *decorum*, rather than representing a superior use of *pathos*, is explored in Chapter 2. The idea is rooted in the debate’s rhetorical framework and, for the *coin du roi*, represents its complete abandonment. Thus, when Travenol remarks (like numerous others) that Rousseau resorts to name-calling, he explains that it is because he finds himself humiliated by his own inability to convince the partisans of French music.¹²¹ This points both to Rousseau’s excessiveness and his ineffective use of rhetoric, the former stemming from the latter. For the *coin du roi*, such excess—whether in the debate or in music itself—reflects a desperateness, rather than a willingness to use tools to their fullest extent: when all else fails, the Italian side unwisely resorts to techniques of shock that are especially unnatural to the measured French character.

¹²⁰ Fréron, *Lettres sur la musique française*, in *QB*, 791.

¹²¹ Travenol, *La Galerie de l’Académie Royale de Musique*, in *QB*, 1501. The extent to which this frustration in the face of an inability to convince is revelatory of excessiveness grows further as the author describes Rousseau (through his satirical embodiment of the latter) coming to actual physical blows using empty bottles (1516). Even though the form is satirical, the indication of a complete and thus excessive lack of *decorum* in the *coin de la reine* could not be any clearer. It is a recurring theme, with descriptions such as “invectives... grossières” (1536) that reveal veritable repugnance towards the character of Rousseau’s attacks. The *coin du roi* sees the latter not as Ciceronian violence but as a desperate, underhanded attempt of last resort to win at all costs.

Other thinkers also consider the reverse side of the coin: how Italian music is representative of its country of origin. This reinforces the idea that each country rightly feels a certain national pride that affects its intellectual and cultural production. For Caux de Cappeval, foreignness is as key to the Italians as the French: he writes that “il faut qu’une musique nationale, pour être bonne, porte le caractère de la nation; et sur ce principe, la musique Italienne est excellente...” shortly after defining national Italian character as “la folie.”¹²² This statement is an attack on a perceived lack of intellectual horsepower on the other side of the aisle and of the Alps, but it also cleverly alludes to the numerous *folias* in Italian music, both indicating just how different Italian music is from French music and giving credence to the author’s implicit characterization of those who openly embrace the Italian style as *fous*.

Just as it is proof of the existence of French music, foreignness is a convenient tool to attack the credibility of the *coin de la reine*: after all, how can those who purport to be experts on every aspect of the quarrel—and in particular French music—be trusted if they themselves are not French? There are often remarks that reflect this incredulity in the French side’s texts, such as Jourdan’s indication that Grimm’s prophet could not possibly be a good judge of French artistic production by the mere fact he is German,¹²³ or the ironic suggestion by Fréron that Rousseau would be better off staying in his home country: “Quelque gloire qu’il nous en revînt, nous ne voulons point enlever à la Ville de Genève l’honneur d’avoir donné le jour à ce grand homme.”¹²⁴ Though it is an obvious position, the argument is nevertheless used repeatedly and often expanded upon to demonstrate other fundamental flaws or even deny the very validity of

¹²² Caux de Cappeval, *Apologie du goût français*, in *QB*, 1568.

¹²³ Jourdan, *Le Correcteur des bouffons*, in *QB*, 200.

¹²⁴ Fréron, *Lettres sur la musique française*, in *QB*, 794.

the quarrel's central duality.¹²⁵ Thus, the Père Castel notes that "M. R. tout étranger qu'il est, et parce qu'il est étranger, connaît mieux ce ton; il peut le donner."¹²⁶ The deeply ironic tone is reinforced through the double use of the word "étranger" to describe Rousseau, and this repetition also stresses that his foreignness defines his very worldview.¹²⁷ The same sense permeates Caux de Cappeval's *Discours apologétique*, in which "Musique Ultramontaine," which is to say Italian music, is repeatedly associated with and dissolved into "l'Allemagne et la Suisse,"¹²⁸ referring not only to Rousseau and Holbach but also to foreign ways of thinking that are as unnatural to the French as is the music from beyond the Alps that they seek to foist upon a proud nation. The author is furthermore well aware that viewing Italian music and the *coin de la reine*'s overall thought process in this manner actually places France at the center of the equation.¹²⁹ In fact, the other side's very interest in how Italian and French music are related—and, indeed, the very concept of foreignness it has introduced—indicates that French thought and French music are still very much relevant.

¹²⁵ For instance, in his *Lettres d'un académicien de Bordeaux*, in *QB*, 1370, Castel makes reference to "L'antiparallèle de la Musique Italienne," questioning the possibility of the comparison in the profound disparity of its components. Similarly, and less subtly, Caux de Cappeval uses adjectival qualification to transform Rousseau's letter into his "lettre paradoxale sur la Musique Française," and continues to use language in a clever fashion by linking "des Allemands et des Allobroges" to Grimm, Holbach and Rousseau, "faisant, qui pis est, les Philosophes et les Prophètes." The ridiculousness of foreign influence for Caux de Cappeval is emphasized as he concludes: "C'est ici qu'on peut bien dire qu'on nous a fait une querelle d'Allemand," *Apologie du goût français*, in *QB*, 1554. The statement both reflects the absurdity of the *coin de la reine*'s foreign leadership and casts a condescending shadow on foreign thought processes. One thing is certain: for the partisans of French music, French taste is far from dead.

¹²⁶ Castel, *Réponse critique d'un académicien de Rouen*, in *QB*, 1443.

¹²⁷ Such references abound and always go towards the question of legitimacy central to good rhetorical discourse. For example, Castel precedes a passage on Rousseau (*Lettres d'un académicien de Bordeaux*, in *QB*, 1368) with a series of qualifying statements, including "en bon Français... mon Coeur, Français aussi..." By not placing them directly in the passage on Rousseau but nevertheless prefacing the latter with these comments, Castel subtly guides his reader to question Rousseau's qualifications to comment on French music.

¹²⁸ Caux de Cappeval, *Apologie du goût français*, in *QB*, 1562.

¹²⁹ He thus notes that "c'est relativement à nous qu'il s'agit de Musique Ultramontaine," *Ibid.*, 1565.

With this point firmly established, the significance of belonging to one group or another is underlined by the *coin du roi*'s frequent attacks on Rousseau's foreign status, almost as a means of paying him back for having devised the division between two *coins*. In fact, the doubly-emphasized "étranger" noted just above can be seen as a reference to the second academician's *Lettre*, in which Castel cleverly questions Rousseau's impartiality through an indication that he was born between France and Italy, so should be impartial (yet is not): by depicting Rousseau as "M. R. qui est né entre la France et l'Italie,"¹³⁰ Castel subtly emphasizes his foreignness while seemingly making a mere statement of fact—one that certainly is undisputable. A careful reading reveals that Rousseau consequently contracts a doubly foreign persona that places him apart from either *coin* in a relationship of observation rather than appurtenance, not dissimilar to his self-marginalization in relation to the *philosophes*: he is foreign to both France and Italy, which means he has no real right to speak for—because he does not belong to—either side. In this sense, the *citoyen de Genève* is relegated to the rank of mere meddler who may be inferred to take matters less seriously than those who have real stakes in the quarrel.¹³¹ In this sense, Rousseau's *Lettre sur la musique française* integrates into his broader attacks on both the *philosophes* and his host country. They are depicted by Castell and others as

¹³⁰ Castel, *Lettres d'un académicien de Bordeaux*, in *QB*, 1376. In his subsequent fourth letter, Castel expounds on the point, showing just how deep-rooted French music is in its relation to the historical roots laid out in the previous letters: "Non-seulement nous avons une Musique, je n'aurais pas prévu qu'on pût le disputer; mais une Musique propre, nationale, spécifiquement Française, Gauloise même si on veut; Musique de notre crû, de notre terroir, dû-elle sentir le terroir en effet pour ceux qui ont l'odorat, le goût ou l'oreille moins Française, ou plus délicate que nous si l'on veut," 1394. The culinary metaphors—uniquely French in their repeated link to the singular notion of "terroir"—are significant in that they relate to another particularly important area of French pride, indicating that both are firmly linked to the French national identity that has been erected over the preceding century.

¹³¹ This links to the idea developed in Chapter 4 that attacking French music is tantamount to attacking the country and all its customs. As such, Rousseau's apparent inability or unwillingness to understand this proves just how un-French he is, and brings to light the seriousness of his criticisms.

an obstinate refusal to understand just how much his statements are an affront to the nation,¹³² revealing a lack of *ethos* and of *judicium*. Additionally, this means that Castel's complimentary description of Rousseau as French of heart and Italian of mind hides his true sentiments, which can only be seen as indicative of Rousseau's doubly-foreign status by those who have been trained to appreciate rhetorical discourse. Those who can decode the passage as *epideictic* are able to find its true meaning, requiring a form of amplification on the part of the reader that we will see is key to the survival of eloquence.

The question of Frenchness is particularly important to the *coin du roi*: its defense of French music is often a defense of what it means to be French. Thus, when Castel cites Fontenelle's "dent en or" story as it is retold by Rousseau, he is quick to note that Fontenelle is a true Frenchman, and that Rousseau—an implicit foreigner—takes away wrong lesson.¹³³ Rousseau's lack of judgment in this instance seems directly linked to his not being French, an indication that he cannot truly appreciate French music and, indeed, many other aspects of French society.¹³⁴ As noted previously, Rousseau's foreignness even impedes his understanding

¹³² The question of hurt French pride goes beyond mere defensiveness. For Castel, it is one's clear allegiance to the king that is at stake, and he is offended by an attack of French music in that it is representative of the French people and Rousseau's perspective thus views the latter as unworthy of having their own music.

¹³³ Castel, *Lettres d'un académicien de Bordeaux*, in *QB*, 1390. See p. 103 for further details on the Fontenelle story re-told by Rousseau. Castel's claim is at least in part an effort to re-claim Fontenelle for his side. This is perfectly logical, given that the author had been one of the chief leaders of the Moderns during the quarrel of the Ancients and Moderns, the ideas espoused by the latter being mostly represented by the *coin du roi*.

¹³⁴ This non-Frenchness may even go further and, at times, play a part in a sort of protectionism. Indeed, in his eighth letter (*Ibid.*, 1437), Castel later compares Italian music to pantomime, mere imitation, and little more than "singeries." Clearly it is not enough to imitate: one must build on previous efforts, not simply emulate them. However, this also seems to go towards the previously-mentioned idea that French music, as well as French thought and the country's political system, are intellectual, while Italian music and all that it may represent is not.

of certain linguistic subtleties, such as the proper way to address women.¹³⁵ This irreverence is a faux pas and an indication that Rousseau and his cohorts—the foreignness of their approach amplified by their status as actual foreigners and compounded by their embrace of foreign culture—do not really understand what makes French taste (the *bon goût* so revered by their opponents) unique and superior. Caux de Cappeval similarly uses foreignness to shift his focus from Rousseau to Italian music and, as such, a broader target. Thus, he lays the blame for his own attacks and the *coin du roi*'s reproaches in general at Rousseau's feet, while diminishing the *philosophe*'s role: "il faut s'en prendre aux *Agresseurs*: pourquoi la Musique Ultramontaine fait-elle faire des extravagances, même à des Philosophes Suisses?"¹³⁶ Just as Rousseau takes away Rameau's power,¹³⁷ so does Caux de Cappeval for Rousseau himself: it is beyond Rousseau's will to resist the power of Italian music and the latter is thus clearly the real root of the problem. Italian music is unwholesome and has an unholy power to convert, to which Rousseau is little more than a slave (finding himself turned into a "Fanatique").¹³⁸ This not only diminishes the power of the opposing side's leader but also points out the excessiveness so despised by the *coin*

¹³⁵ See previous footnotes 50 and 51 on Rousseau's linguistic mistreatment of women, as described by Bonneval and Castel. The idea is compounded by Castel (*Ibid.*, 1409), as he goes on to accuse Rousseau of making inelegant use of the French language by repeatedly writing "nos femmes," an uncouth expression that no self-respecting French gentleman would use, let alone repeat in this fashion.

¹³⁶ Caux de Cappeval, *Apologie du goût français*, in *QB*, 1571.

¹³⁷ See Chapter 2 for a full analysis of Rousseau's technique.

¹³⁸ By referring to Rousseau as "ce Fanatique, en fait de Musique," in his *Arrêt du conseil d'état d'Apollon, rendu, en faveur de l'orchestre de l'opéra*, in *QB*, 893, Travenol nearly dehumanizes Rousseau, painting him as someone who will stop at nothing and respects none of the usual social conventions in his attacks. This inevitably leads to a form of "extravagance" (895) that reflects Italian music itself.

du roi as a major issue that goes against *bon goût*, re-emphasizing the bizarre, foreign aspect of both the music and the arguments favored by the *coin de la reine*.¹³⁹

Thus, when Fréron refers to women's alleged disinterest in Italian music, this is clearly meant to be a strong blow to the other side: "les femmes, qui certainement, par la délicatesse et la sensibilité qui leur est naturelle, sont des juges compétens et peut-être infaillibles en matière de gout, ne sont point du tout touchées des beautés de la Musique Italienne."¹⁴⁰ In this depiction, women not succumbing to the lure of Italian music seems due to the true French nature of their "sensibilité" (clearly not possessed by Rousseau, as seen in the Caux de Cappeval quote above), which is the result of a deep cultural exposure that is the backbone of true French taste.¹⁴¹ Rochemont¹⁴² confirms the point with his seemingly-casual depiction of what defines French

¹³⁹ The very argument being made—as an application of Rousseau's own technique—may be an illustration of this ridiculous aspect, or what Travenol refers to (*Ibid.*, 895) as his "burlesque Système." This idea is reinforced by Caux de Cappeval's frequent references to *Don Quixote*, linked to the characterization of the other side as *folia* (see previous commentary, p. 82) and culminating in a clever, doubly-foreign depiction of Rousseau as "le Quichote de Genève," *Apologie du goût français*, in *QB*, 1571. This particular emphasis on the foreign goes towards the idea of cross-referencing examined in Chapter 4, for Caux de Cappeval is directly echoing Fréron's appellation from nine months earlier in his *Lettres sur la musique française*, in *QB*, 788, in which he calls Rousseau "le *Don Quichotte* de la Musique Italienne" and plays up both the ridicule and foreignness of this role by also dismissing him as "le *Pythagore* de Genève" (782). This mix of overt ridicule (through *Don Quixote*) and deep irony (Geneva not being known as a center of great mathematical theorems) link good taste and measure with France and excesses of all forms—be they theoretical, musical or personal (as seen in Rousseau's misplaced pride)—with the *coin de la reine*.

¹⁴⁰ Fréron, *Lettres sur la musique française*, in *QB*, 767.

¹⁴¹ The affiliation of influential women with the *coin du roi* is directly inherited from the society of *salonnières* that existed in the seventeenth century. According to Pekacz in "The Salonnières and the Philosophes in Old Régime France," their status is challenged in the *querelle des bouffons*, although she concedes that they find refuge in the *coin du roi* (289). As we have seen, the importance of women as the arbiters of good taste remains alive throughout, and is especially visible in the *coin du roi*'s insistence on Rousseau's inability to comprehend this facet of French culture. The role of women as "pure" judges unaffected by common biases is slightly shifted to reflect a form of education achieved through enculturation. As a result, although "The history of Parisian salons shows, in effect, a decreasing influence of the *salonnières* over things public" (*Ibid.*, 297), women's influence remains strong and is shifted to the public sphere, in which the *opéra*, other public fora and, indeed, the written page itself are the favored places of debate, somewhat replacing the *salons* of the previous century. Their presence in one *coin* or the other—be it literally under the queen or king's box or in the pages of a pamphlet—is clearly indicative of success or failure, as far as the French side is concerned.

¹⁴² Little is known about de Rochemont, other than the fact that he published this brochure anonymously during the quarrel and lived in Lausanne (Fétis, *Biographie universelle des musiciens*, v. 7, 128).

beauty: “Telles sont les beautés que notre goût préfère, auxquelles notre génie nous porte, et qu’il nous est possible de produire.”¹⁴³ He is in fact referencing the *coin du roi*’s conception of *decorum* explored in the next chapter, according to which only French taste can dictate what is appropriate for France, including the direction French music should take. These ideas relate to the common preconception of education, in that being educated in France may be the key to the particular cultural brand of understanding Rousseau so sorely lacks. Indeed, Castel later notes that educated listening makes all the difference and that the ear of a Rameau or a Mondonville is needed to fully appreciate French music,¹⁴⁴ which is to say that being fully French from a cultural perspective—a unique quality provided by French education—is necessary.

The *coin de la reine*’s response to this characterization is simple: what its opponents see as the pride of the nation is in fact a form of stagnation and the indication of an unavoidable decline in French music. Indeed, D’Alembert is quick to remark on the “indigence”¹⁴⁵ of French opera. Its native, non-foreign quality and the notion that it is the product of a rich, unique cultural education are turned on their head: French music’s derivation from tradition is decidedly negative, a sort of inbreeding that stifles creativity and stems from an unavoidable decline already in progress. It is also this emphasis on the foreign as positive that ultimately allows for

¹⁴³ Rochemont, *Réflexions d’un patriote sur l’opéra français et sur l’opéra italien, qui présentent le parallèle du goût des deux nations dans les beaux arts*, in *QB*, 2172. For Rochemont, as for others in the *coin du roi*, the question of foreignness has real-world repercussions: any solution which results in an imitation of Italian music by the French will surely lead to the disavowal of French music, first by the rest of Europe (the possibility of this already having happened conveniently being ignored) and then by the French themselves.

¹⁴⁴ Castel, *Lettres d’un académicien de Bordeaux*, in *QB*, 1395.

¹⁴⁵ D’Alembert, *De la liberté de la musique*, in *QB*, 2215.

Rousseau's bold claim that the French have no language.¹⁴⁶ It is particularly interesting within these deliberations on the concept of foreignness that Rousseau's opponents should choose to characterize the thinker as a "sophiste." We noticed this earlier, in the section concerned with textual layering, and the term's usage may in fact well be an implied reference to the sophistic revival that began in the first century, which—once again—pitted Asianism against Atticism. Such a hidden reference is particularly apt in that the sophists were particularly concerned with matters of eloquence, one side—which just happens to be the foreign one—relying on deep emotion and embracing strong impact, and the other—constituted of the those who supported Athenian heritage—defending a classicism based on grand, national traditions. The dispute was also a continuation of previous debates (beginning with Cicero, who is among the first to consider the opposition of Asianism and Atticism, ultimately advocating a middle style),¹⁴⁷ adapted to its time, much like the present quarrel. This particular dispute is therefore a model for subsequent thinkers like Quintilian, as well as for the *querelle des bouffons* itself: veiled references such as this one indicate that our quarrelers are conscious of their inscription in the rhetorical debates that preceded, and that their reflections on music are inextricably linked to considerations on the status of eloquence.

¹⁴⁶ When Jourdan writes in *Le Correcteur des bouffons*, in *QB*, 210, that "Quoiqu'il en soit, Messieurs les Allemands et Messieurs les Suisses, vous ne parviendrez point à nous dépouiller de notre Musique vocale, *que nous aimons parce que c'est la nôtre* et qu'une autre Musique ne ferait que grimacer sur nos paroles..." Rousseau sees an opportunity to turn around both claims: foreignness (which Grimm also turns into pride but in a different way, making it French) becomes something that is valued in this new era that relies on the public as a judging entity and factors in the opinions of other European countries, and the uniqueness of French music—without being denied—is seen as bad precisely because of its link to a language that has no musicality. Rousseau understands the impossibility of denying a national music, so takes the surprising and theoretically-audacious—yet argumentatively-sound—step of pinpointing the French language itself as the problem.

¹⁴⁷ Fumaroli explains in *L'Âge de l'éloquence*, xiv, that Cicero considered the old Roman style simple, the grand or high style representative of Asian influences, while his own school embodied the middle style.

The evolution of French style and taste

Perhaps even more than the opposing side and despite many of its members' resistance to any sort of reform, the *coin du roi* realizes that times are changing. For its members, the evolution from Lully to Rameau has yielded a new style based on grand traditions. The *coin de la reine*, however, sees this as confirming a decline in French music and, as a result, French taste as a whole. For the partisans of Italian music, saving France's reputation in matters of music by any means necessary is therefore a way of stopping this decline and restoring the country's position of authority, even if this means accepting the defeat of French music as it currently stands. Rather than halting the process of degradation, for the *coin du roi*, such a defeat would mark the beginning of its decline and therefore cannot be accepted. Both sides share the preconception that France is a leader in all matters intellectual and cultural, and that its choice at this crossroad will help determine its own future as well as that of Europe.

On the French side, one of the most common retorts to the obvious (yet repeated) indication that Europe has chosen Italian music for good reason is that other European countries had no real choice because none of them had a Lully of their own.¹⁴⁸ The recurring questioning of foreignness plays a part in widening the sense of fundamental opposition thusly, and the idea of Italian music in France as a passing fad finds some credence as a result: "Un Opéra Italien isolé paraîtra bientôt aussi insoutenable qu'un bavard impérieux qui usurpe la conversation, qui étonne d'abord, et qui finit par excéder."¹⁴⁹ Beyond going against *decorum*, Italian music finds

¹⁴⁸ For example, this is stated by Bonneval in *Apologie de la Musique et des Musiciens Français*, in *QB*, 1070.

¹⁴⁹ Voisenon, *Réponse du coin du roi au coin de la reine*, in *QB*, 275.

itself confronted to the core values of French *bon goût*, which it has no chance of fulfilling,¹⁵⁰ and the idea that it must therefore be of temporary interest can be understood. What may seem alluring will become grating in its excessiveness, prompting Voisenon—an author of plays, operas and epicurean poetry, as well as a frequent *salon*-goer, prominent member of the *société du bout du banc*, future *Académicien* and lifetime friend of Voltaire (whose affection he won after writing him a letter when he was a mere ten years of age)—to seemingly attempt a reversal by exclaiming “Ces pauvres Italiens.”¹⁵¹ Although this effort to place the Italian side on the defensive is not successful, nor all that serious, it reflects the desire on both sides to move quickly with the pace of the debate, and it again amplifies the foreignness of the other side, in response to the idea that the French way is outmoded. Such a retort is effective, transforming the opposition of new and improved against old and outmoded, into a defense of hallowed French values against the attacks of tasteless, excessive invaders.

For the *coin du roi*, the quarrel’s foreign element is also key to most of its questioning of its rivals’ capacity to adapt. As noted previously, the partisans of French music often use the foreignness of Italian opera and its concordant strange way of reasoning to justify a similar lack of adaptability on the other side: how can Italian music—and the overall method of reasoning offered by its supporters—expect to satisfy a French audience without any form of modification? For many partisans of French music, this fundamental, rhetorically-sourced flaw is the definitive proof that French music is still necessary and the Italian style will ultimately be irrelevant.

¹⁵⁰ To this point, Voisenon, *Ibid.*, 276, reminds the reader that the other side is led by “deux Allemands” who think they have found “le Goût,” which is clearly impossible.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 275.

However, as noted in the previous section, certain thinkers also go beyond the mere contrasting of French and Italian by creating an opposition between French taste and the *philosophes*, depicting the latter as untrue to French ideals. In this endeavor, music is the evidence that helps them prove their point. For example, Caux de Cappeval, one of the most outspoken anti-*philosophes*, opposes the eccentricities of these thinkers to the reasoned approach of French musicians in his *Apologie du goût français*. After opening his text in this manner, he then makes it known that his central attack will be on Rousseau's *Lettre*, concluding that the popularity of this "Libelle extravagant" by one of those "prétendus Philosophes" is little more than a passing fad.¹⁵² This sentiment directly alludes to the other texts of the *coin du roi* that claim Italian music is itself a temporary phenomenon. By presenting Rousseau's theories as despicable and improper in their extravagance—a direct reflection of Italian music—, Caux de Cappeval seeks to discredit both the music supported by his opponents and their overarching claims. This attack on the *philosophes'* *ethos* through their musical choices is indicative of the latter reaching far beyond their boundaries in music's relationship with eloquence. In order to allow for such a trenchant position, Caux de Cappeval resorts to positioning Rousseau and his cohorts as out to destroy something much larger than one might suppose, namely "le Temple des Arts."¹⁵³ Just a few years prior, Rousseau had in fact penned his *Discours sur les sciences et les arts*, which won the *concours* of the Académie de Dijon and went against the common conception that the arts and sciences represent the pinnacle of humanity's progress. By opposing modern society's refinement to the virility of the warriors of yore, Rousseau is certainly

¹⁵² Caux de Cappeval, "Discours Apologétique" to the *Apologie du goût français, Relativement à l'Opéra*, in *QB*, 1552: "C'est un de ces prétendus Philosophes qui vient de publier contre la Musique Française un de ces Libelles extravagants, qui ne paraissent que pour passer du mépris universel dans l'oubli le plus humiliant."

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*

questioning certain fundamental values that are embodied in France by institutions such as the *académies* and the *opéra*. Caux de Cappeval's mention of the "Temple des Arts" thus once again uses layering to refer to Rousseau's previous excessiveness as an indication of his hidden intentions in the *querelle*, and links the other side's attacks to all that is fundamentally French: the *ethos* of a whole country as embodied by its arts—and particularly by music—is being impugned. As such, the *coin de la reine* is again engaging in a form of excess, confirming that only the supporters of French music are authentic in both their production and their theories. Caux de Cappeval's line of reasoning is also a direct response to Rousseau's attack—which the *coin du roi* sees as attacking French thought as a whole—and the most logical response is therefore to put into question philosophy as a whole, Rousseau having made himself the *philosophes'* representative. In essence, Caux de Cappeval posits the debate as centering around the opposition of *philosophie* and *raison*,¹⁵⁴ with each country's music respectively incarnating these concepts. He uses all the means at his disposal to continually reinforce the idea of *philosophie*'s invalidity, including humor: whenever he says anything that may be considered "des injures," he notes (facetiously) that he is speaking as a *philosophe*.¹⁵⁵

The forcefulness of these attacks and the way in which they are aimed at certain underlying foundations are indications that the *coin du roi* truly feels besieged. Its vigorous defense finds its roots in music's representation of larger issues, including the crucial linguistic

¹⁵⁴ For the poet that he is, poetry is the cure to the "cervelle renversée" (Caux de Cappeval, *Apologie du goût français*, in *QB*, 1569) of the *philosophes* but, more broadly, the latter are opposed to the *coin du roi* and its reasoned representatives.

¹⁵⁵ Caux de Cappeval, *Apologie du goût français*, in *QB*, 1558. Similarly, the author implies through lexical repetition that all terms similar to "extravagance"—and, using a form of linguistic amplification, "trop d'extravagance" (1557)—are synonymous with "philosophie." Eventually, the reader comes to read "philosophie" as "extravagance," as well as the opposite of French style, thus associating Italian music and the reasoning of the *coin de la reine* as a whole with a lack of measure.

link stressed by Rousseau in a country where language has become particularly important over the last century, and—though this is rarely admitted in an overt fashion—a sense that French music is in fact in a perilous position. Cazotte, one of the quarrel’s participants who seeks to portray himself as “ni d’un coin ni de l’autre” states as much in his *Guerre de l’opéra*, published early in the quarrel: “Ce sont-là, Madame, les ouvrages et les sujets dont les succès ont paru menacer notre Chant Français, et en particulier notre Opéra d’une chute prochaine et absolue.”¹⁵⁶ The author does not mince his words and seems to foresee just how important the *querelle* will be, as well as the true direction French music is headed. His like-minded compatriots from the *coin du roi* (for his writings place him in this *coin* despite his declarations of impartiality) are quick to heed Cazotte’s warning, and their newfound appreciation of Rameau can at least in part be explained by this sense that not embracing him as their musical leader could result in a complete loss of any French music. In this sense, Rameau’s rise to glory is therefore greatly rhetorical in nature and has to do more with defense of homeland than a true appreciation for the composer’s compositions. Indeed, many thinkers in the *coin du roi* are reticent supporters of Rameau,¹⁵⁷ leading Rulhière to see the *philosophes* themselves as causing the Enlightenment’s general obsession with science and, of course, philosophy:

¹⁵⁶ Cazotte, *La Guerre de l’opéra: lettre écrite à une dame en province par quelqu’un qui n’est ni d’un Coin ni de l’autre*, in *QB*, 323.

¹⁵⁷ Rulhière points out Rameau’s too great reliance on science: “Il est venu un Musicien qui a trop négligé la partie du sentiment pour la science de l’harmonie,” *Jugement de l’orchestre de l’opéra*, in *QB*, 445. The brilliance of Rousseau’s placement of Rameau at the heart of the other side’s defense can be seen in such instances: as both a derivation from and a contrast to Lully, his very presence is divisive for the *coin du roi*. This is why Rulhière and others favor Mondonville, which paradoxically brings their argumentation in line with Rousseau’s (to the point where some of Rulhière’s arguments could be straight out of Rousseau’s *Lettre sur la musique française*) and deeply weakens Rameau—with notes such as “Ils verront dans l’Opéra de Tiron des tableaux d’harmonie d’autant plus savants qu’on n’a pas besoin de science pour les entendre...,” *Ibid.*, 447—without displacing him as the leader of French opera.

La Musique a presque suivie en France le destin des autres arts agréables; on a laissé perdre le goût pour se livrer à une science aride. Ce n'est plus l'agrément que l'on cherche; dans les Belles-Lettres on ne parle que de détruire des préjugés; dans la Musique on ne veut que paraître savant: notre siècle a-t-il bien raison d'élever si haut cet esprit philosophique qui remonte à la source de tout, qui fait l'analyse de toutes les causes?¹⁵⁸

In his reluctant defense of Rameau, Rulhière goes on to cite Lully and a number of respected authors from the previous century to show that “bon goût” is independent from the newfound obsession with philosophy. If French music is to survive, so must French taste in its appreciation of the very function of the arts. Thus, what the other side sees as decline is in fact the only thing that can save French music: avoiding innovation (whether through explanation like Rousseau or a tendency towards the avant-garde like Rameau)¹⁵⁹ and the artifice that goes along with it, is key to retaining what makes French taste unique.

So, responses from the *coin du roi* seek to position French music as remaining true to its linguistic roots, while evolving through its eventual (if initially resistant) new embrace of Rameau. In fact, the French side's ability to adapt is often greater than might be expected, as seen through this very acceptance of Rameau as its leader. After being appointed by Rousseau to this position, the composer becomes one of the French camp's strongest weapons, with declarations like “*Rameau* est certainement le premier homme de son siècle.”¹⁶⁰ In such

¹⁵⁸ Rulhière, *Ibid.*, 444.

¹⁵⁹ For the *coin du roi*, anything that is too experimental is rejected because it fails to provide *decorum*. Rulhière thus questions the way in which Rameau intersperses the “air doux et charmant de la Rose” with “des bourdonnements sourds et désagréables,” *Ibid.*, 445. As Rulhière continues, the importance of restraint as a component of taste based on *decorum* is unmistakable: “si la Musique peut tout peindre, il est des peintures auxquelles le goût défend de s'arrêter.”

¹⁶⁰ Voisenon, *Réponse du coi du roi au coin de la reine*, in *QB*, 271. This is a turning point, as Rameau has mostly been rejected until now.

instances, he is used as an emblem not only because taking pride in the qualities attacked by Rousseau is a way of strengthening the camp but because he incarnates the *merveilleux*, which has been criticized by Grimm in the *Petit Prophète*. So, in adapting to the situation quickly, the partisans of French music are also able to use Rameau in a defense of their side's core values.

On the Italian side, this modified version of previous French traditions is seen as a mere degradation. Building on the opposition of French and non-French, a central claim of the *coin de la reine* is already apparent early on in Grimm's *Lettre sur Omphale*: one of French music's biggest downfalls is the very artificiality it denies. As such, Grimm points to the grave errors committed by those who believe French music to be natural:

Ils [les partisans d'*Omphale*] me parleront du goût, du naturel, et de l'expression qui sont dans le chant de cet Opéra, est c'est précisément sur ces choses-là que je veux l'attaquer. Selon moi ce chant est d'un bout à l'autre de mauvais goût, et rempli de contresens, triste, sans aucune expression, et toujours au-dessous de son sujet, ce qui est le pire de tous les vices; sans compter que la basse continue toujours errante au hasard, parcourant avec incertitude le clavier, sans savoir où s'arrêter, ne rencontre à la fin la dominante que pour finir, presque toujours à contresens, sur une cadence parfaite.¹⁶¹

The closing statement of this argument is particularly strong because of the very French manner in which Grimm has developed the passage, both in terms of his chosen terminology and his approach. Rousseau will make repeated use of this technique, which consists in turning opponents' arguments on their head through the use of their own techniques and jargon. Grimm does this here to a lesser extent by indicating that the essence behind why listeners support

¹⁶¹ Grimm, *Lettre sur Omphale*, in *QB*, 10.

Omphale is in fact completely false and by using all the most quintessentially French arguments to demonstrate this error. Thus, from a philosophical standpoint, *Omphale* is about as un-French as possible, with its “mauvais goût” and “contresens.” Musically, however, the opera is very French (through the music’s complete subjugation to text and poor bass line), which points to the incompatibility of French thought and French music. This incongruity goes both towards a conception of poor *decorum* in the French style, and increasing the believability of Italian music as the logical French choice. To this end, Grimm’s last statement incites the reader to wonder how the nation that brought about Cartesian logic and took such great pride in the *vraisemblance* of its tragedies can allow its music to be so illogical.

Part of what leads to what the *coin de la reine* sees as incomprehensible choices is a result of poor rhetorical practices and the very cause of French music’s decline: it fails to adapt not only to its listeners’ evolving tastes but also to the larger changes that bring about this transformation in taste. Thus, Holbach’s ironic portrayal of ill-advised French pride in his *Lettre à une dame d’un certain âge* underscores the *coin du roi*’s inappropriate conception of the relation between music and eloquence, which is unable to—and even absurdly proud not to—adjust to its audience: “Courage fidèle orchestre! L’inflexibilité de votre goût et la raideur invincible de vos bras, nous font des garants assurés de la durée de notre musique.”¹⁶² More than anything else, Holbach’s disdain is due to his view that if French music is to be successful—or even remain relevant—it cannot be inflexible. For the supporters of the *coin de la reine* who see themselves as trying to save French music, this rigidity is what leads to its inevitable isolation: “vous resterez à jamais, comme vous prétendrez l’être depuis longtemps, le plus singulier

¹⁶² Holbach, *Lettre à une dame d’un certain âge*, in *QB*, 128.

Orchestre du monde.”¹⁶³ It is clear that what once made French music and performance style great has become their very downfall.

This theme recurs throughout Grimm’s analysis of Destouche’s opera and a sense of disbelief mixed with indignation becomes palpable:

En vérité, s’il est permis de faire de la Musique de cette façon, je me mettrai en société avec trois ou quatre hommes les premiers venus et tout aussi dépourvus de talent que moi, nous nous partagerons fidèlement les Vers, un par un, par hémistiches même, s’ils sont trop longs, et nous ferons des Opéra.¹⁶⁴

Although the statement seems to call into question the place of amateurs in the musical realm, careful observers who read between the lines will note that this passage is not in opposition to the ones examined in the next chapter.¹⁶⁵ Rather, it reinforces the sense that the views of an informed layperson such as Grimm are to be taken seriously: far from being an attack aimed at non-experts, this is a validation of their participation. Indeed, if Grimm and all those “dépourvus de talent” when it comes to composition (and perhaps even indeed performance) are able to look beyond French composers’ tactics of seduction and find real problems with their music, such input is valuable. What is unacceptable is for those who are considered experts to create something unworthy of their standing as such. The fact that Destouche’s errors are due to not following the rules also seems to be an indication that a certain code is to be observed, whether

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*

¹⁶⁴ Grimm, *Lettre sur Omphale*, in *QB*, 32.

¹⁶⁵ In Chapter 2, Grimm’s argument is seen to encourage the participation of non-experts, though only as applied to commentary, rather than production.

in musical composition or in the debate surrounding the latter, an idea Rousseau will embrace and fully develop in order to mold the *querelle* to his ideals.

It is no surprise, then, that Rousseau carefully constructs his argument following the model of rhetorical discourse in order to make his point against the division of vocal and instrumental music,¹⁶⁶ with the latter achieving too high a status at least in part due to the decline of French taste. He showcases his credibility by making note of his expertise and understanding of musical terminology, all the while making ample use of Italian terminology: “Ces autres mots, *rinforzando, dolce, risoluto, con gusto, spiritoso, sostenuto, con brio* n’auraient pas même de synonymes dans leur langue, et celui d’expression n’y aurait aucun sens.”¹⁶⁷ Rousseau also introduces a hint of humor by playing on the meanings of the word *nuance*—as signifying both a linguistic difference in meaning and the very topic of musical volume he is examining—in a way that alludes to the linguistic roots of music he holds dear: “En la jouant comme la leur, ils l’énerveraient entièrement; ils feraient fort les doux, doux les fort, et ne connaîtraient pas une des nuances de ces deux mots.”¹⁶⁸ Beyond the clever wordplay, the all-important role of language can be felt in both in the use of Italian and in the observation that French is simply unequipped to describe music properly. To cover all his bases, Rousseau also attacks French musicians in a footnote to this enumeration, pointing to their incapacity to play appropriately as so flagrant that they need not bother learning the meaning of the Italian terms he has cited. This propels his argument to another level, as the causes and consequences of French musical style are attacked: both the two main sources of the disaster that is French music (*ingenium*, as embodied primarily

¹⁶⁶ See the previous examination of just how important unity of the vocal line and its accompaniment are to Rousseau, p. 69.

¹⁶⁷ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 148.

¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*

by the French language but also the composers) and those who execute it (*actio*, or the performers) are assailed here, along with the listeners who are incapable of discerning good music from bad, if through no fault of their own. In fact, D'Alembert uses a similar argument to absolve Lully of guilt in his poor compositions: he remarks that Lully understood the importance of language, having his libretti acted out before composing and thus properly using declamation as his model. For D'Alembert, this resulted in the best possible music, which was poor because the language on which it was based was poor: “Il est vrai que de là il n'en peut résulter qu'une musique monotone; mais c'est le défaut de notre langue...”¹⁶⁹

The framework proposed by the two authors is further reflected in Rousseau's duality of the non-existence of French terms to appropriately describe (i.e. appreciate) music and the aforementioned intentionally-overwhelming laundry list of terms available to the Italians. It is apparent that Rousseau is going beyond merely indicating the varied capacities of the two languages or even the levels of appreciation of the two nations. While the adjective “baroque” had been used to describe French music, it is now echoed with the description of “petits ornements froids et maussades” and the way musicians “aimeraient mieux jouer proprement que d'aller en mesure.”¹⁷⁰ Contrasted with the Italian terms, Rousseau's own use of language reveals a deeper disparity in the two corners' overall ways of thinking. Indeed, the common portrayal of French attachment to the technical aspects, rules and regulations of art forms such as music is contrasted with the Italian focus on music's and eloquence's common essence: emotion and persuasion. Their vocabulary demonstrates this and the supposed French absence of such a lexis (or its absurd reduction to a mere two terms, “fort” and “doux”) showcases the disparity

¹⁶⁹ D'Alembert, *Réflexions sur la musique*, in *QB*, 1661.

¹⁷⁰ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 148.

poignantly. By linguistically emphasizing the lack of subtlety and variation in French music, as well as linking the danger posed by French music's degradation to eloquence itself, Rousseau paints French musical style as having descended to such depths that it is incapable of fulfilling its expressive aims, and French taste as having been forced into a similar state—in part due to its own lethargy, but more significantly because of its musical and intellectual leaders' deficiencies—that renders it unable to discern the good from the bad.

Building a better battle: strategies of attack and defense

The unquestionable popularity of Italian music throughout Europe's courts, concurrently with a marked decline in the performance of French opera outside of France, leads to an obvious choice: accept this phenomenon and its implications for French music both beyond and within the country's borders, or take up the defense of French music. However, there initially occurs a period of complacency, during which French thinkers are seemingly unbothered by what is happening, content in the continued success of their music at home. This complacency and inaction, referenced earlier,¹⁷¹ are the factors that initially lead the *coin de la reine* to begin the debate: in a way, France's dearth of leadership—especially beyond its borders but also within, in the lack of acknowledgment of Italian opera as a real threat to the French genre—seems to bother the supporters of Italian music more than the defenders of French music. As a result, during the

¹⁷¹ See p. 65.

quarrel's inception, Rousseau and his colleagues sometimes seem to be debating for the purpose of waking up the other side.¹⁷²

Whatever the case, both sides accept that once a debate has begun and the corners have been formed, attack and defense are the main mechanisms by which to engage. For Rousseau and the vast majority of the *coin de la reine*, firmly choosing a side is vital because it is the only way to engage in a debate that will offer the opportunity to go back and forth on the issues and eventually declare one side victorious. Though the *coin du roi* is more reactive in its role, its partisans also understand the importance of choosing sides and most of them support such a clear division.¹⁷³ Marin, for example, notes that the very idea of reaching mediation through a hybrid form of French and Italian music would be monstrous: “ils feront des monstres,”¹⁷⁴ he declares. For both camps, the debate's clear division between attackers and defenders is born from Italian music itself, since it has in effect gradually replaced French music in Europe and the question is now being debated—and Italian music being performed—on French soil.

Rousseau is the first to theorize the quarrel as rhetorical and posit the duality of attack and defense. He begins with the former softly, following the schema of good persuasive

¹⁷² Later on in the debate, in March 1753, Diderot sees growing apathy within the *coin de la reine* and indicates as much in the initial pages of *Les Trois chapitres, ou la vision de la nuit du mardi-gras au mercredi des cendres*, in *QB*, 497, calling for a return to action. There is therefore a sense throughout the quarrel that a vigorous, active debate must be maintained in order to reach any sort of satisfactory outcome.

¹⁷³ There are a few exceptions, such as Fréron's depiction of the quarrel's petty aspect, with his ironic indication that Rousseau is “semblable à ces soldats vraiment utiles et nécessaires dans les Troupes, qui sans aucune raison cherchent dispute, afin d'engager leurs camarades à montrer du courage,” *Lettres sur la musique française*, in *QB*, 795. However, like most others, this objection mainly has to do with Rousseau himself and his particular motivations, as mentioned previously. It also must be noted that those who present objections nevertheless go on to willingly engage in the debate and thus accept its format. For instance, Rulhière uses the frequent critique of excess to demonstrate the other side's lack of *decorum*, yet his writings reveal a desire to help solve the debate and to influence its unfolding. Indicating that all the *coin de la reine* really cares about is success (“leurs querelles ne sont que suspendues lorsqu'on est excédé de part et d'autre,” *Jugement de l'orchestre de l'opéra*, in *QB*, 441), he fully agrees with Rousseau on the choice of deliberative discourse as favoring the process over the end result (even if he sees the other side as not abiding by this choice).

¹⁷⁴ Marin, *Ce qu'on dit, ce qu'on a voulu dire*, in *QB*, 479.

discourse within the letter proper as he did in the prefaces to the two 1753 editions of his *Lettre sur la musique française*, but in relatively subtle ways. For instance, in his *peroratio*, the philosopher relates a story told by Fontenelle in *L'Histoire des oracles* and uses it as a springboard for his central theory. The effect is twofold: it attenuates the bold claim that Rousseau is clearly going to make concerning the existence of French music, and gives the writer credibility by drawing on a famous story from a respected writer of the end of the previous century who happens to have been both a *scientifique* and considered by many to be a forerunner of the ideas espoused by the *siècle des lumières*—one of the foremost leaders of the Moderns in the quarrel of Ancients and Moderns, giving Rousseau added credibility for the French side, since he himself is aligned with the ideas championed by the Ancients (and currently represented by the partisans of Italian music). Interestingly, the particular story Rousseau chooses to summarize illustrates how Fontenelle used amusing or surprising anecdotes to entertain his reader and better persuade him to come around to his way of thinking. This points to Rousseau's understanding of the importance of Fontenelle's application of rhetorical principles and the link between eloquence and music, given the latter's propensity to have an effect beyond that achieved by words alone. Since the story of “La dent en or” also happens to be written in a fashion similar to scientific demonstration and deduction, the author is presenting himself as a rational thinker capable of countering the science-based theories of a Rameau, while implicitly attacking the latter for not being methodical enough.¹⁷⁵

¹⁷⁵ The preeminent advocate of music as the supreme science and a keen supporter of demonstrability, Rameau is thus being taken to task in his own arena. As seen in Chapter 2, this is one of Rousseau's signature rhetorical techniques.

Rousseau then moves on to the core of his thesis, seeming to question the very existence of French music and thus taking the existing argument over the merits of French and Italian music in a new direction. Not only does this reformulation reevaluate the basic premises of the argument, it also reveals the extent to which partisans of Italian music could be virulent in their attacks. From a rhetorical standpoint, this forceful position of attacker—rather than the inherently weaker role of defender taken on, through no choice of its own, by the *coin du roi*—gives Rousseau and his supporters the stronger hand from the start. It is obviously easier to poke holes in an existing genre than to try to defend one's self and attempt to fabricate new arguments in response to critiques. By taking the position that French music might be entirely bad, to the point of not even existing, Rousseau intentionally leaves little room for negotiation or reaching common ground, while his complicity with the French nation¹⁷⁶ serves to augment his credibility and demonstrate the objectivity of an insider who has come to a seemingly unexpected realization. This approach also gives Italian music a de facto position of importance, perhaps endowing it with too much aggressiveness but certainly erasing any possible sense that it is insignificant to French theorists. The forcefulness of Rousseau's claim is also initially couched in a polite tone that uses the conditional mood to convey its thesis as a mere proposition that will be examined and only possibly proven. Gradually, this quality will be replaced with a far more forceful manner, much like a long *crescendo* or gradual increase in *tempi*, that finally culminates

¹⁷⁶ Note the careful use of pronouns in the lead-up to Rousseau's infamous statement (which, as mentioned, p. 45, does not elude the *coin du roi*): "avant de parler de l'excellence de **notre** musique, il serait peut-être bon de s'assurer de son existence, et d'examiner d'abord, non pas si elle est en or, mais si **nous** en avons une," *Lettre sur la musique française*, 141, my emphases.

in Rousseau's infamous—and the quarrel's most referenced—declaration.¹⁷⁷ One cannot help but notice that, along with this increased force, the division between the *coins* has reached its apex: no longer does Rousseau need to couch his intentions in terms such as “nous” and “notre,” which are replaced by “les Français,” “ils” and “eux.” In the long footnote that accompanies this closing statement, Rousseau confirms that there is no room for theoretical or musical compromise when it comes to choosing sides, using the idea of a hybrid musical form to demonstrate that any such attempts would lead to a “dégoutant assemblage... trop monstrueux pour être admis.” This helps explain the way in which the two sides agree on the debate's fundamental structure and even use the exact same arguments,¹⁷⁸ without this ever leading to any sort of meeting of the minds when it comes to substance. It is the clear division between attackers and defenders that allows for a similar separation of form (which follows the rules of rhetoric and can freely be duplicated from one side to the other) and content (which stays divided along party lines).

Even in early quarrel texts like the *Lettre à M. Grimm*, such force can be felt, if towards different ends. With the heavy lifting still remaining to be done, Rousseau's aim is to promote the formation of clear argumentative camps. Having found in the *Lettre sur Omphale* a number of inspiring ideas that coincide with his own theories, Rousseau decides to pick Grimm as the first member of his team, noting that

¹⁷⁷ Rousseau's notorious closing sentence is the linchpin that brings about the quarrel's second, rhetorically-violent phase, and ensures a firm division based on the two *coins* that allows for a structured dialogue from this point forward: “D'où je conclus que les Français n'ont point de musique et n'en peuvent avoir, ou que si jamais ils en ont une, ce sera tant pis pour eux,” *Ibid.*, 184.

¹⁷⁸ For example, Rousseau's terminology in this passage clearly mirrors that of previous quarrelers, including Marin's “monstres” referenced above, p. 102. In this case, the authors from opposing sides agree that a mixture of Italian and French music would be unnatural but the reasons behind their belief are completely different.

Il n’y a point d’homme au monde, quelque génie qu’il puisse avoir, qui soit en droit d’asservir votre raison; pas même M. de Voltaire, le maître dans l’art d’écrire de tous les hommes vivants.¹⁷⁹

Adding to this an endorsement of philosophy and humanism—in that he recognizes in Grimm “le vrai Philosophe et l’ami des hommes,” which both serves to bolster Grimm’s reputation and define the *philosophes* who will comprise the *coin de la reine* as serving a purpose beneficial to mankind—, Rousseau is both opening up the debate to all those with the intellectual ability to take part, and instructing quarrel participants to stay firm and never back down. Thus, the idea of a virulent but reasoned quarrel is forming, with the *coin de la reine*—imbued with the force of philosophy¹⁸⁰ and even Voltaire himself—ready to strike with its full force. The passage’s concluding sentences are in the same vein:

Continuez donc d’aimer et de cultiver des talents qui vous sont chers et dont vous faites un bon usage. Mais n’oubliez pas pourtant de jeter de temps en temps sur tout cela le coup d’œil du sage, et de rire quelquefois de tous ces jeux d’enfants.¹⁸¹

In addition to supporting the direction taken by Grimm, Rousseau is already calling for close readings that seek out true meanings. Applying this approach to the sentence that follows immediately, the seeming disdain for the infantile aspect of the debate is in fact a way of ridiculing the other side’s objections and placing the Italianists in a position of superiority: the *coin de la reine* will ultimately rise above the menial aspects of the quarrel and is already in a

¹⁷⁹ Rousseau, *Lettre à M. Grimm*, in *QB*, 116.

¹⁸⁰ As noted earlier, this aspect of the *coin de la reine* is vigorously attacked by its opponents. Discrediting the *philosophes* as a whole is seen by some as a necessary step to emerging victorious from the quarrel.

¹⁸¹ Rousseau, *Lettre à M. Grimm*, in *QB*, 117.

position of superiority with philosophy on its side, which clearly indicates that it is not the one engaging in “jeux d’enfants.”¹⁸² However, Rousseau is aware that grand statements are not enough and his strategy of attack will evolve as the quarrel progresses, as seen in the way he eventually aligns Rameau with Lully. This stroke of genius allows him to seriously weaken his opponents¹⁸³ and, using the narrow and relatable discussion of music, make the *coin de la reine*’s attack all the more clearly about a wide range of issues that define France as a whole.

For its part, the *coin du roi* is aware of its position of response and often plays up the validity of its defense by characterizing the other side’s attacks as improper or unwarranted. Thus, the repeated indications of Rousseau’s personal vendetta are meant to weaken the *coin de la reine*’s overall approach and, consequently, its very reason for being. When Rulhière cites the *Discours préliminaire de l’Encyclopédie* and accuses its authors of mere speculation concerning music, describing the *coin de la reine* as “ces Savants qui ont pris parti avec tant de fureur pour la Musique Italienne, et qui prétendent donner la loi au reste de la Nation,”¹⁸⁴ a level of intimidation in the face of the *Encyclopédie* is felt. In this somewhat precarious argument, Rulhière does indeed acknowledge the power of the *Encyclopédie* in its clear acceptance by the public, but he also reveals the unjust power of the Italian side not only in its appropriation of

¹⁸² Diderot similarly finds these types of debates to be unworthy of the *philosophes*’s attention. He even goes so far as to call for a cease-fire, referring to personally-motivated pamphlets as “tous vos petits écrits,” *Au Petit Prophète de Boemischbroda, au grand prophète Monet; à tous ceux qui les ont précédés et suivis, et à tous ceux qui les suivront*, in *QB*, 417.

¹⁸³ For instance, early in the quarrel, Jourdan embraces Rameau but shows deep disdain for Lully. For him, whereas the former has true vision, the latter can take no credit for the success of his music: “Il passa pour constant que Lully était le Dieu du Récit, et on s’accoutuma plus que jamais à le croire, sans oser soupçonner que sa déclamation modulée, jointe aux vers de Quinault, était la source du triomphe,” Jourdan, *Lettre critique et historique sur la musique française, la musique italienne, et sur les bouffons à Madame D...*, in *QB*, 456. With this type of recurrent commentary in the *coin du roi* at the quarrel’s inception, Rousseau’s attack on Rameau via Lully almost leaves the other side no choice but to embrace both or neither, thus forcing certain somewhat reluctant lines of argumentation on its part.

¹⁸⁴ Rulhière, *Jugement de l’orchestre de l’opéra*, in *QB*, 446.

such external elements but also in its generally excessive use of force. While effective, the *coin de la reine*'s tactics lack *decorum* and are essentially un-French. Similarly, when Bonneval states that he does not name certain living composers, "pour répondre à [leur] modestie,"¹⁸⁵ he is indicating that the *decorum* so essential to his camp dictates a code that is not being observed by the other side. This idea is also used to show a particularly despicable brand of underhandedness in the Italian camp: "La Séquelle frénétique ne dit mot; mais que fait-elle? Enragée du succès, elle se divise par pelotons, se répand de tous côtés et glisse sourdement son venin," writes Jourdan.¹⁸⁶ By playing with the double meaning of the word "séquelle," the author indicates that his side has been successful in wounding its adversaries, while depicting the latter as a dangerously-unbalanced and unpredictable party (which is emphasized with the immediate juxtaposition of the term "frénétique"). These are not the qualities sought in great debaters and they seem amplified by the easy success achieved thus far by the *coin de la reine*—due mostly to its rallying around Rousseau's call to action and his immediate implication of Grimm, as well as the initial lack of any counterarguments written on the same level of the Italian side's initial efforts—, which interestingly turns this triumph into a form that its opponents view as inappropriate, deranged excess that directly mirrors the excessiveness contained within Italian music itself. As we noted in the Introduction, it is this forceful line of argumentation—especially following Rousseau's *Lettre sur la musique française*—that provides the partisans of French music with the motivation they need to become more fully implicated in the quarrel. As it begins to organize, one of the *coin du roi*'s defensive strategies is therefore to show the adversary to be underhanded and so desperate for victory that it is willing to slither its way into enemy territory

¹⁸⁵ Bonneval, *Apologie de la musique et des musiciens français*, in *QB*, 1067.

¹⁸⁶ Jourdan, *Le Correcteur des bouffons*, in *QB*, 203.

by any means. This conjures up not only the idea of possible traitors within the *coin du roi*, creating a sort of doubled-up defense (within the camp and without), but also the vivid image of a snake. Whether the coinciding biblical imagery in Jourdan's *Correcteur des bouffons* is a reference to Grimm's *Petit Prophète*, which would have come out some days prior—too recently for a full analysis but perhaps allowing at least an allusion to the text—, is unclear but the author unmistakably depicts Italian music as an evil temptress and the *coin de la reine*'s rhetorical techniques as fully mirroring its chosen music's immorality. The partisans of French music's weakness is therefore their strength, for their position of defense is a form of tough resistance that represents a moral high ground and refuses to give in to certain destructive primal impulses.

Along these lines, there is also a sense that the *coin du roi* takes pride in its allotted position of defense, whether or not for moral reasons. Often, this is visible in the pure sense of patriotism it espouses,¹⁸⁷ while its implementation of a bellicose lexicon turns its defense into an active pursuit. Thus, Castel references “toutes ces guerres” in his sixth *Lettre* and repeats “je combats” several times in quick succession.¹⁸⁸ War, violence and the idea of an active defense are fully embraced with the clear indication that this is necessary because France is under attack. This can be reconciled with Jourdan's idea of a moral defense in the pure, patriotic motivations behind the vigorous response that, in his mind at least, differentiate it from the excess on the other side. Easily mixed with a quasi-protectionist form of patriotism, this approach is taken very

¹⁸⁷ For instance, Caux de Cappeval takes on the position of defense willingly in his *Apologie du goût français*, in *QB*, 1557, embracing what it offers the *coin du roi* as victim: “la bonté victorieuse de ma cause; je n'entre dans la querelle que pour ma part de Citoyen. Voilà la source unique, et tout le soutien de mon zèle: quel en est l'objet? La patrie.” This makes the debate about France and defense of Nation, rallying people to his side.

¹⁸⁸ Castel, *Lettres d'un Académicien de Bordeaux*, in *QB*, 1420.

seriously by thinkers such as Castel,¹⁸⁹ mostly because of their presentation of music as being the very essence of French culture. This means that the foreign element previously examined takes on a particularly great importance for the *coin du roi*, which does not see itself as being exclusionary but, rather, as upholding its duty to provide leadership for Europe. As Jourdan puts it, France is “le pays du goût”¹⁹⁰ and therefore must not allow itself to be drawn to false prophecies. In so doing, it risks losing a vital component of its identity and significantly diminishing its longstanding leadership in matters of *ingenium*. Similarly, the *coin du roi* uses differentiation to embrace its position of defense to the fullest, which leads Jourdan to note that “Un autre avantage qu’ont les Italiens, est l’applaudissement général de toute l’Europe... Je ne sais en vérité ce qu’on peut opposer à ce cri général des Nations si différentes d’humeur et de caractère, et toutes cependant réunies dans un même point.” In admitting that Italian music has managed to unite very different countries, France is depicted as the only country—by clever opposition to a *coin de la reine* now simply termed “les Italiens”—that has stood its ground. Not only is Jourdan’s quizzical conclusion a call for true Frenchmen to rally to his side, it is also an indication that the only answer possible in response to Italian music’s European success is a reaffirmation of French culture. In effect, it is a call to arms—long awaited and much like Rousseau’s on the other side—that manages to promote the most vigorous defense possible by trusting in the reader’s natural allegiance to France and its fundamental values.

*
**

¹⁸⁹ It must be noted that this is not always the case and that other thinkers occasionally ridicule the querulous aspect of the debate, in an effort to invalidate it as a whole. These two differing approaches reveal that the *coin du roi* is less unified than the other side, which is a predictable result of its position of response.

¹⁹⁰ Jourdan, *Le Correcteur des bouffons*, in *QB*, 211.

No matter one's side, it is clear that the quarrel's framework is rhetorical and that music serves both to illustrate and inform this approach. Cicero's idea of violence as key¹⁹¹ is certainly respected in both corners, and the *querelle des bouffons* does indeed showcase French intellectual focus and determination, with each *coin* staking out theoretical claims and defending them with vigor. D'Alembert best depicts this eloquent violence transposed from ancient Greece into the modern arena of the *parterre de l'opéra* as "Cette guerre... notre parterre divisé présentait l'image de deux armées en présence, prêtes à en venir aux mains."¹⁹² Naturally, the participants never actually cross the boundary that separates the intellectual from the physical. Far from being improper, the strength of the sentiments expressed is an indication of both the debate's vitality and the commitment of its contributors. The quarrel's "fermentation violente"¹⁹³ is criticized by some but, when it is focused on issues rather than people (and often the latter really can be found to represent the former), it is recognized as a sign of just how seriously the debate is taken. Its inscription in a rhetorical framework allows for a common approach to the discussion that maintains cohesiveness among the strong oppositions created by the two *coins*. This very combination of a shared rhetorical context and deeply opposed ideals—albeit with certain subtle points of contention within each corner—leads to the presentation of two distinct

¹⁹¹ See footnote 89.

¹⁹² D'Alembert, *De la liberté de la musique*, in *QB*, 2205.

¹⁹³ *Ibid.*, 2206. D'Alembert also correctly points out the history of conflict between what has become the quarrel's two *coins*, implying that their fomentation took numerous years and indicating that the *bouffons* had made their first visit to France thirty years prior. These notes give credence both to the idea that the Ancients and Moderns remain a valid duality, even if they are no longer the central focus, and that Rousseau's framework is fair and historically based.

perceptions of the relationship of eloquence and music, which will form the focal point of the next chapter.

In considering this relationship, the mapping of a musical quarrel on eloquence allows its participants to define the aspects they deem essential. From these considerations emerges an untraditional form of collective *memoria* guided by a creator (whether an author or a composer) but residing in the reader or listener. This is seen in the retention of Rousseau's catchy *air* by the king days after the inaugural performance of *Le Devin du village* and in the expectation that participants in the quarrel—pamphleteers and readers alike—are to stay abreast of the intricacies of its unfolding. Such an transformation of *memoria*—from its position exclusively within the orator to an externalized rendition that retains the qualities of its original form and continues to signify much more than simply “memory”—reveals two different conceptions of *ingenium* and *judicium* that lead to varied definitions of *bon goût*, and opposing views of what defines simplicity. The latter is key in that it goes towards the notion of what is essential or required, and thus informs each side's definition of *judicium*. While the *coin du roi* sees excesses in every facet of Italian music—be it in the force of its melodies, the content of its stories or its argumentative reduction to mere “sophismes”—, the *coin de la reine* attacks Rameau's harmonic constructs as awkwardly heavy and French performance style as aberrant in its valuation of unessential aspects that impede music's essence. These arguments find their roots in the debate of Asianism versus Atticism, which informs each side's conception of structure: a clear, guiding melody that functions as the main line of argumentation exists on one side (this clarity through simplicity allowing for great strength), and a valuation of moderation through deliberate slowness and harmonic balance is the pride of the other (which also serves as a defense of

patria). The participants realize that some of the most fundamental questions—such as the debate over the merits of melody as opposed to harmony—cannot be resolved (both sides of each question being equally important and neither disprovable) and use their multilayered approach to address such complexities by examining the other topics that these seemingly-unresolvable oppositions incorporate. Thus, Rousseau’s construction of a shared *memoria* is, for him, a way of subtly demonstrating the superior status of melody: if the king is able to remember his opera long after it was performed, it is thanks to its appealing melody, while one supposes humming it provides a deeper level of pleasure and an kindling of rhetorical principles that harmony’s complexities cannot transfer to the public. More generally—in music as in eloquence that has been transferred to the written form—, simplicity (as embodied in musical melody) allows for this receptive *memoria* to be activated, which ensures the guiding thoughts remain with the listener or reader, allowing him to reflect (whether consciously or not) on what he has learned to a greater extent than would otherwise be possible.

Another key rhetorical goal espoused in the quarrel’s patterning on eloquence—and closely linked to this notion of collective *memoria* nurtured through simplicity—is the aim of *docere*: educating the reader proves important for both sides, but the path to learning is approached differently. The French side sees it as a long enculturation process based on traditions, while the Italianists require more of an individual process that relies on select leaders—and music itself—to guide an essentially personal journey for the listener. In both approaches, there is a sense of serving the greater good and the need to establish intellectual and musical leadership to achieve this aim. For both sides, one of the most important ways of ensuring the listener fulfills his role is through *delectare*, which ensures that the masses are

reached. *Delectare* was traditionally music's primary role and remains so for the partisans of French music, while the Italian side seems to encourage greater innovation, allowing *docere* and *movere* to be featured more prominently. For instance, the *coin de la reine*'s call for variation is a way of achieving the pedagogic goals of *docere* without forsaking *delectare*, and it is countered by the strong incorporation of *decorum* on the other side. The *coin du roi* deems that the results will be more appropriately suited—and therefore more enticing—to its public. As we will explore in the next chapter, it is therefore no surprise that the French valuation of moderation and *delectare* lead to very different points of emphasis than does the Italian insistence on strong persuasion through *movere*.

So, for both corners' leaders, music clearly contains more than what is apparent, which deepens its bond with eloquence—the latter being built on layers of meaning—and allows for examinations of larger issues, such as what constitutes foreignness. Along these lines, Rousseau's story of the Armenian of Venice is the type of demonstration that serves this broader context. It leads to discussions like those surrounding the status of nature and of women. Interestingly, by introducing the notion that his Armenian-Venetian protagonist is in fact extremely well educated but a blank slate when it comes to music, Rousseau's example reemphasizes the importance of education, while incorporating the idea of natural, personal taste and expression in music. This leads the other side to respond by depicting French women as detaining a similar status: they maintain their usual innocent, savage-like quality that gives them impartiality but have also benefited from French enculturation, qualifying them to be good judges. The main difference is that one scenario suggests abstracting one's self from an excellent upbringing—but retaining all intellectual faculties cultivated therein—in order to rely on

personal sentiment, while the other is almost the exact reverse, encouraging a conditioning through the embrace of traditions that lead to good taste. So, music is emblematic of a wide range of social, cultural and political issues, helping to explain the contributors' fervor, and allowing for these topics to be broached without affecting the debate's integrity (in its stated thematic choice). It is also this very nascent multiplicity of ideas that fosters the growth of individual contributions and may eventually allow for a fundamental agreement on the need to defend eloquence, paradoxically born out of the quarrel's division into two *coins*. Thus, the unimpeded exploration of theories facilitated by the *querelle*'s musical topic and governed by its rhetorical context is what will engender a special form of written eloquence that both reinforces the value of eloquence and breaks away from certain of its preconceptions.

Beyond the *Delectare* Principle: Two Conceptions of the Relationship Between Eloquence and Music

I. For the <i>coin de la reine</i> , eloquence and music at the service of <i>movere</i>	121
Eloquence and music's progressive fusion through <i>pathos</i>	122
Perceiving an inability to move in the other <i>coin</i>	133
II. The <i>coin du roi</i> 's convergence of eloquence and music in <i>bon goût</i>	139
Towards a definition of French <i>decorum</i>	140
Eloquence and music as a critique of excess	145

Throughout the *querelle des bouffons*, music is conceived on either side in its relationship with eloquence, and not merely in its well-known connection to affects, which is technical and

relies on a form of mimesis.¹ The quarrel's framers are far more interested in exploring the deep bonds between the two disciplines and the ways in which they inform each other: is music only meant to please or, like eloquence, is its purpose multifaceted? Clearly, there is a tendency to lean towards giving music a greater role than merely that of *delectare*. To begin, music is perceived to be more related to eloquence—and therefore to the multifaceted characteristics we have explored—than other arts, whether in its Ancient origins, its level of complexity or its overarching aims and effects. Like painting, music affects without a necessary passage through language, but its close relationship with eloquence precisely reestablishes this linguistic link (often seen as necessary), both in terms of content (through its narrative qualities) and form (such as in its ability to be conceived of in terms of the parts of discourse), which is difficult for an art such as painting to achieve with the level of intricacy that music can. Music is also nevertheless one of the arts that remains hardest to grasp, leading to continued debate and a vast field of possible discussions. Since eloquence is ingrained in society, thinking of music in its rhetorical context is a way of making it more relatable, and examining the relationship between the two is helpful to both arts. In considering this relationship, the quarrel's thinkers—and particularly

¹ What is sometimes referred to as *affektenlehre* or the theory of the affects, if it is indeed possible to reduce the relationship of rhetoric to music to this one aspect, is a unidirectional approach founded by German music theorists, which relies on rhetoric to explain—and compose—music through the application of rhetorical techniques (albeit with subtle variances in the meaning of rhetorical terms, as they apply to music). It does not consider the reverse relationship, which we will attempt to show exists in the quarrelers' view of eloquence and music as speaking to each other and having a reciprocal impact. Joachim Burmeister coined the term “*musica poetica*” and his 1606 book bearing the same name provides an explanation of how composers use Cicero and Quintilian's rhetorical principles, such as following to the letter the parts of discourse, to elicit specific emotional responses (first with religious music, and then with the secular variety as well). See Matheson's 1739 *Der Vollkommene Capellmeister* and Bartel's recent analysis of this question (*Musica Poetica: Musical-Rhetorical Figures in German Baroque Music*) for varying takes on this idea—particularly by Baroque German composers—, all going towards this idea of music mapped on rhetorical principles and the notion that specific body parts are linked to idealized emotional states or affects (the body's temperaments—sanguine, choleric, melancholic and phlegmatic—being closely related to musical temperaments and producing specific affects, such as joy, anger, sorrow or peacefulness, through the use of *tempi*, certain intervals, rising or falling sequences, and the like).

those in the *coin de la reine*, who are after all the first to conceptualize the debate as a quarrel—conclude that music does indeed go beyond providing pleasure.² So, building on a conception of musical form modeled on the essential principles of eloquence, rather than purely mirroring its internal structures and techniques, both sides also agree that music is best evaluated and judged in its reciprocal relationship with eloquence. For the two *coins*, the way in which good music takes its cue from good discourse in its overarching formal considerations—and in return affects certain of the latter—is of greater interest than the minutia of applying rhetorical figures of speech to musical composition.³ We saw that simplicity is in part prized for this very reason and espoused by both sides as one of music's main aspirations, due to its closeness to nature. This chapter's central claim is that, for the *coin de la reine*, the resulting relationship between eloquence and music translates into a sort of universality that sees the sign of musical production's greatest success as born from the idea that eloquence must reach as wide an audience as possible to have the greatest impact (and vice versa), while the *coin du roi* tends to reject this view and interprets the goals of eloquence as achieved to their fullest when they are successfully targeted at a specific audience, thus having a greater chance of moving it.

I will argue that there is therefore a fundamental difference in each side's understanding of *decorum*. The partisans of French music value moderation—even going so far as to embrace slowness as a virtue—to form a version of *convenance* that encourages both restraint and reflection. An acceptance of the values that have led to the construction of *bon goût* is critical in

² Nevertheless, the importance of *delectare* should not be neglected. Both sides acknowledge it is a fundamental aspect of music. See Chapter 1 and footnote 85, below.

³ Quarrelers from both sides regularly criticize their opponents for too much reliance on technical considerations. In the *coin du roi*, for instance, Rulhière notes that “la Musique Italienne est pleine d’Epigrammes; la Française est plus noble, elle cherche plus à être vraie qu’à paraître ingénieuse,” *Jugement de l’orchestre de l’opéra*, in *QB*, 442.

that this influences both the music being produced and the country's very perception of what constitutes good music, ensuring a sort of homogeneity—reflected in French music's outer sameness, which is highly criticized by its opponents but incorporates an inner harmonic complexity that, for its supporters, forms its strength—that defines French taste and gives French composers and authors alike the keys to best pleasing, moving and persuading their audience. Those who favor Italian music, on the other hand, ask the listener to be receptive to the various influences vying for his attention from all sides—including those that are completely foreign—and select the ones to which he finds himself deeply connected. Thus, tailoring content to a specific type of listener is not as important because music that is truly eloquent will have the strongest impact on anyone who really listens—using a clear, strong melody to guide the listener to make the right choice, supported by relative harmonic simplicity—, and will consequently be the most persuasive for any given audience.

Such differences in approach allow for two very different perceptions of the relationship between music and eloquence. Just as the *coin de la reine* took the lead in conceiving the quarrel's aims and structure, it is the first to insist on the manner in which eloquence and music are interconnected. Partisans of Italian music see eloquence and music as intrinsically linked through their common ability to have a strong impact that places *movere* in a preeminent position. The latter relies on *pathos*, the lack of which in the opposite camp becomes proof of French music's ineffectiveness. On the other side of the argumentative divide, the partisans of French music accept the existence of a relationship between eloquence and music but defend a vision of their melding that privileges the traditional placement of *delectare* in the first position. Their version of the relationship is constructed around the *coin's* notion of *decorum* through

moderation. It avoids all manners of excessiveness, as embodied by the opposing camp—be it through its too-great reliance on *pathos* or other forms of unacceptable violence, both in terms of its musical and argumentative choices.

I. For the coin de la reine, eloquence and music at the service of movere

Throughout the quarrel, achieving strong emotion is the central aim of both eloquence and music for the *coin de la reine* but there is a concurrent sense this can only be achieved once certain other fundamental precepts have been established, as explored in Chapter 1. This can be seen in the different paths taken by each *coin* in response to the notion that music must be appropriate both for what it seeks to convey and for its intended audience. As such, the *coin de la reine* considers its public important but disagrees with its adversaries on the point that its tastes are necessarily dictated by regional or nationalistic preference. Good music should appeal regardless of its provenance and if the *coin du roi* prefers French music, despite all its flaws, it is by force of habit: the French have become used to their language's sounds and their music is thus pleasing to their ears.⁴ Thus, the lack of objectivity on the other side is due to a sort of cultural acclimation, which is equally to blame for its inability to appreciate Italian music. Cazotte and the other partisans of French music are unmoved by Italian opera because they have not learned to appreciate it: “il faut avoir appris à l’entendre.”⁵ This reinforces music's relationship with eloquence, through the idea that the learning principles that allow understanding and appreciation are necessary to both music and the debate itself: careful listening seems to take its

⁴ After revealing the necessary monotony of French music, due to its loyal patterning on monotonous French declamation (as illustrated by Lully having his libretti read aloud to him by actors prior to composing his operas' music), D'Alembert resolves that the French public's sincere pleasure in their music can only be due to convention. See *Réflexions sur la musique en général et sur la musique française en particulier*, in *QB*, 1661.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 1666.

cue from or at least indicate the necessity of close reading.⁶ The *coin de la reine* agrees on this point, yet is quick to point out that Italian music is far more accessible than its French counterpart. The two notions can be reconciled by viewing the very obstacle to appreciating Italian music depicted by Cazotte as not resulting from the music itself but from a French approach that necessarily creates a barrier to accessing it without considerable effort. The partisans of Italian music would in fact prefer relying on their music's natural persuasive force to achieve their aims, with the multi-layering examined in Chapter 1 remaining a feature for the most advanced listener (rather than having an overtly complex form, as they perceive French music to do). This will increasingly become accepted, once the reasons for Italian music's authority and the possible objections from its opponents have been addressed.

Eloquence and music's progressive fusion through *pathos*

One of the ways in which ensuring music is appealing enough to elicit close listening, establishing *delectare* as a steppingstone to eventually achieving *movere*, is through considerations of form. Thus, musical variation is particularly important for the *coin de la reine*, helping it reach the widest audience and please the largest subset of listeners. In fact, this is one area in which eloquence can learn from music, through what Diderot calls Italian music's ability to "être simple sans être plat."⁷ As in Rousseau's principle of *unité de mélodie* (as defined in the last chapter, and in stark contrast with Rameau's harmonic complexities), one must aspire to simplicity above all but pleasing is also important, and variation is thus a way to ensure that one is understood—allowing, for instance, the rhetorical technique of repetition to strengthen an

⁶ This is an important point for several theorists of the *coin de la reine*, especially Rousseau, and is analyzed in Chapter 4.

⁷ Diderot, *Le Petit Prophète de Boehmischbroda*, in *QB*, 183.

idea's inculcation—without being off-putting. This creates an obvious parallel to the way in which the thinkers' texts incorporate a variety of arguments aimed at different segments of readers (as seen in Rousseau's constant shifts), testing every approach in hopes that the reader will be convinced by one of them. As seen below, the other side takes a very different approach.

Of any form of discourse or music, the one that is presented by the *coin de la reine* as most representative of the lost eloquence of ancient Greece is the recitative. Its appurtenance to both eloquence and music serves to illustrate the possibility of an ideal sort of interdependence between the two domains based on their ancient fusion and, from the onset of Rousseau's *Lettre sur la musique française*, it is clear that this affords recitative a uniquely prominent place within the *querelle*. The author begins by defining the broad concept and underlining its essential relation to language:

Je ne sais, Monsieur, quelle idée vous pouvez avoir de ce mot; quant à moi, j'appelle récitatif une déclamation harmonieuse... dont toutes les inflexions se font par intervalles harmoniques. D'où il suit que, comme chaque langue a une déclamation qui lui est propre, chaque langue doit aussi avoir son récitatif particulier...⁸

By engaging the reader directly, Rousseau draws his attention to the importance of the subject and, offering a seemingly personal definition of recitative, calls for the reader to compare his own definition to Rousseau's. In the likely case he does not have one (recitative being an underappreciated musical form in France, according to Rousseau), the reader might just be inclined to adopt the characterization being proposed. The use of the word “déclamation”

⁸ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 173.

additionally places recitative in a rapport with language and, more specifically, eloquence.⁹ So does the introduction of harmony's two roles, which just happen to be rhetorical and musical. Indeed, the reader may be surprised to find musical harmony named here (since this potentially gives it unnecessary weight), but by putting forward the idea that harmonic intervals are the means by which recitative achieves the type of harmony found in eloquent discourse, Rousseau offers an indication that something other than harmony guides the form, while harmonic intervals are simply a technical component of its execution (resembling performers). Finally, recitative's necessary variation based on the speech patterns of its country of origin demonstrates the preeminence of language in Rousseau's climate-based theories. Yet, as seen throughout the *Lettre*, Rousseau's well-known linguistic inspiration goes beyond language in search of a rhetorical dimension, as the author quickly adds that variations in language do not affect one's ability to compare two forms of recitative "pour savoir lequel des deux est le meilleur, ou celui qui se rapporte le mieux à son objet."¹⁰ Therefore, *judicium*—the same *judicium* that allows one to determine the success of a speech or a piece of music—is not affected by geographic location, and there is an implication that if French music were really successful, it would be appreciated—as Italian music is—regardless of the listener's country of origin. Rousseau is influenced by Dubos' aesthetic writings and the notion that the sublime or its equivalent—much like

⁹ Although at the time "déclamation" frequently refers to the speech of actors on stage, here it clearly takes on a more general sense, in Rousseau's depiction of its natural position within the linguistic system. Rousseau's language theories are further examined in Chapter 3.

¹⁰ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 173.

judicium—is able to transcend cultural context.¹¹ However, Rousseau transforms this theory of the sublime and alters some rules of rhetoric to form a vision of music that values *movere* above all else but does so in an unconventional manner. Although it achieves the impact depicted by Dubos, Italian music is in fact much farther from a traditional definition of the sublime than is its French counterpart: while French opera is based on the *merveilleux* and grand aspirations that coincide with the common perception of the sublime born out of French classicism, Italian music neither offers nor requires any of these to achieve its aims. In a sense, Rousseau is countering the French notion of *decorum* with his own, which fuses eloquence with his version of the sublime:¹² he sees *pathos* as resulting from the concept of *ethos* and its association to a middle style—both in Italian opera’s content, which depicts the *bourgeoisie*, and in its structure, based on simplicity and unity—, forming an unusual combination that is partly responsible for music’s special force and does not operate any sort of breach. The linguistic element is temporarily removed from the equation and the reader is reminded that music’s “objet” is to be found in its relationship with eloquence: for music as well rhetoric, persuasion is the primordial goal and *pathos* will become the chief means of achieving it. Within this context, it is rhetoric’s turn to learn from music, in

¹¹ For Dubos, the sublime is a primordial goal for eloquent discourse, as well as for the arts. Defined as deeply moving, it relies on the classical concept of *pathos* and is the product of *ingenium*: “on ne saurait être pathétique sans avoir du génie,” *Réflexions critiques sur la poésie et sur la peinture*, v. 1, 463. Music that fails to move is unsuccessful for Dubos. These ideas—and, in particular, the sense that the sublime is captured in a reaction, rather than defined by geographical or cultural constraints—can be felt in Rousseau’s theories, if they are used to offer conclusions Dubos did not intend.

¹² Dubos drew a parallel between the sublime and eloquence but nevertheless conceived them as separate: “Le sublime de la Poésie et de la Peinture est de toucher et de plaire, comme celui de l’éloquence est de persuader,” *Ibid.*, v. 2, 1. For Dubos, music is to be grouped with “la Poésie et la Peinture” in its primarily imitative role (v. 1, 460-461). Anyone who is deeply moved in the manner endorsed by Rousseau is committing an error, in forgetting to judge music by this criterion of imitation. So, in a sense, Rousseau frees music on multiple levels. Although he substitutes his own requirement of *unité de mélodie* to the necessity of imitation, he also indicates that the public being deeply moved *is* proof of successful persuasion—and that one need not keep in mind a myriad of rules to make a decision, since these are appropriately incorporated into the most effective forms whether or not they are detected by the listener or reader.

that the affective qualities intrinsic to music's *pathos* end up superseding those found in speech and, indeed, language itself. If music and rhetoric are to be persuasive, using a redefined notion of what constitutes the sublime, they must bring about a visceral reaction that enables the recipient to decide in favor of one argument or musical style over another without having to compare the two point by point (even though this will be done as well). This innate ability to move deeply using *pathos* is not a new idea, but it is a feature that both *coins* see Italian music as achieving so naturally that the listener's decision in favor of it may in fact be involuntary¹³ and, for the *coin de la reine*, this is the ultimate proof of effective force achieved through simplicity. For the quarrel's practical purposes, it also forces the listener to act in making a choice and thus joining the *coin*. The French side does not deny Italian music's force but is highly critical of what it sees as a misuse of this force—as well as in its very formation—, which shapes one of the *coin du roi*'s most persisting criticisms, as explored in the chapter's final section.¹⁴

One logical and fruitful way of showing music's unique position among the arts—and of justifying its choice as the quarrel's focus—is to contrast it with painting.¹⁵ The joining of

¹³ See the passage quoted on page 137, in which Rousseau indicates music must “[m’]émouvoir malgré moi.” Along these lines, in *Au Petit Prophète de Boemischbroda, au grand prophète Monet*, in *QB*, 422, Diderot presents *pathos* as bringing about peace through music: as the two *coins* listen to their respective ideal operas, they are so moved that “le poignard leur tombe de la main.” That is to say, they cease to quarrel in this ideal resolution achieved through *pathos* but based on *logos*. This is a recurring theme for Diderot, who calls for a logical, direct comparison of a tragic opera from either side of equal stature and merit in *Au Petit Prophète de Boemischbroda, au grand prophète Monet*, in *QB*, 420. Although it is unclear precisely how this comparison would allow for a peaceful resolution, *pathos* is ultimately recognized—even by Diderot—as having an incomparable impact through music, and the *coin de la reine* believes this feature can be used to overcome almost any other perceived deficiency.

¹⁴ For the *coin du roi*, Diderot is on the right path in his call for a measured approach, and Rousseau's excessive reliance on *pathos* is dangerous precisely because it removes the element of *logos* valued in the concept of *decorum* through moderation explored in the chapter's next section. While it is the ultimate evidence of Italian music's natural persuasive force for the *coin de la reine*, for the French side, involuntarily succumbing to *pathos* is an indication of all that is negative and excessive.

¹⁵ The *querelle des bouffons*' use of the quarrel between line and color—which is more interested with theoretical considerations than a direct comparison of music and painting—is presented in Chapter 3, along with a reminder of the seventeenth century debate's basic premises.

eloquence and music through the comparison of the latter to painting and a justification that uses the former proves to be a recurring theme for the *coin de la reine* in post-*Lettre* texts. Rousseau sums up his view after the quarrel, in the chapter of the *Essai sur l'origine des langues* entitled “Fausse analogie entre les couleurs et les sons,” in which he seemingly gives painting the upper hand by depicting it as the art closest to nature. However, his comparison of the two arts ends up reinforcing the previously-enunciated idea that music contributes to what makes us human:

On voit par là que la peinture est plus près de la nature, et que la musique tient plus à l'art humain. On sent aussi que l'une intéresse plus que l'autre, précisément parce qu'elle rapproche plus l'homme de l'homme et nous donne toujours quelque idée de nos semblables. ...

C'est un des plus grands avantages du musicien de pouvoir peindre les choses qu'on ne saurait entendre, tandis qu'il est impossible au peintre de représenter celles qu'on ne saurait voir.¹⁶

Painting, despite being a vital human invention, does not share the status enjoyed by music. On the one hand, this is because music, like rhetoric, is so closely related to the soul: Rousseau notes of the “signes vocaux” that “ils sont, pour ainsi dire, les organes de l'âme,”¹⁷ signs and the soul both being uniquely human qualities. On the other hand, music has an ability to represent things that are not there, which effectively positions it as an intellectual art¹⁸ and further links it to eloquence. Thanks to this quality, music is able to speak to us on a level very different from that of the other arts. While it may render music further from raw nature, this double status makes

¹⁶ Rousseau, *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, 116. See footnote 40 for the position of this work in relation to the quarrel.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ This intellectual connection reinforces Rousseau's theories concerning melody, since the signs are carried by the latter. It also confirms that his desire for simplicity does not equate to simplification.

music the art closest to the most essential and natural elements of Man. One might contend that, for Rousseau, music is to art what eloquence is to speech and—at least while he is aligned with the *philosophes*—what the Enlightenment is to reason.

Returning to the quarrel proper, D'Alembert takes a similar position in *Réflexions sur la musique* (published in 1754, shortly after Rousseau's *Lettre sur la musique française*), in which music is presented as all about *pathos* and affecting the soul. This begins with the traditional idea that music is related to rhetoric through the affects: “La Musique emploie les sons harmonieux, pour peindre les passions et les différentes situations de l'âme.”¹⁹ For D'Alembert, as we saw it was for earlier theorists such as Dubos, imitation is music's mechanism.²⁰ However, a close relationship between the goals of music and rhetoric is also formed, as persuasion is revealed to be music's ultimate aim:

Ainsi, les sons harmoniques ne peuvent pas peindre le sentiment, mais ils peuvent en réveiller l'idée, et mettre l'âme dans l'état où l'on suppose qu'est celle du personnage qu'on fait agir; et c'est même, de tous les moyens qu'elle emploie pour émouvoir, celui qui produit le plus sûrement cet effet.²¹

Clearly, music attains something painting cannot—in its relationship with eloquence—,²² which intrigues the *coin de la reine*. For D'Alembert, the way in which music achieves persuasion is by

¹⁹ D'Alembert, *Réflexions sur la musique*, in *QB*, 1647.

²⁰ Similarly, Arnaud choses to deal only with “la Musique comme art imitatif.” See *Lettre sur la Musique à M. le Comte de Caylus*, in Laborde, *Essai sur la musique ancienne et moderne*, v. 3, 552.

²¹ D'Alembert, *Réflexions sur la musique*, in *QB*, 1654.

²² For D'Alembert, the effect of good or bad music is explained through painting: representation and imitation cannot be persuasive by themselves. Like an eloquent discourse, music must bring about the same feeling as the real thing would. D'Alembert notes (*Ibid.*, 1652) that simply seeing a bird depicted as singing does not make you hear its song; producing the same effect as the bird's song, however, does. This is where music and eloquence come together, with *pathos* playing a central part in giving music a force greater to painting's.

borrowing from the other two arts he examines: painting and poetry.²³ Indeed, music has the special ability of combining their best qualities: “La Musique réunit les avantages de l’une et de l’autre: comme la Peinture, elle a ses tableaux, qui font sur l’organe de l’ouïe les mêmes impressions que les objets qu’ils représentent: comme la Poésie, elle peut réveiller nos idées par le secours des signes naturels, et même d’institution.”²⁴ Though its arsenal includes only sounds,²⁵ music achieves the two main roles D’Alembert sets forth for the other two arts, both of which reinforce its relationship with eloquence: a good orator must paint images,²⁶ just as he must charm and educate. It is no coincidence that D’Alembert has chosen to present these aspects as the other arts’ most essential components and has given music the uncommon capacity to amalgamate them to its own persuasive ends. This allows music to logically achieve all the principal goals of eloquence and begins to explain its special force.

This reflection on the status of music’s relation to painting is also important in Rousseau’s justification of the *querelle des bouffons* because painting would in some ways have been a more obvious subject of debate. However, for Rousseau, it would not have been as

²³ In *Penser la Musique dans l’Encyclopédie*, 75, Cernuschi shows how D’Alembert grants music a higher position than painting through a “difficulté spécifique à cet art” that allows it to both paint and create sounds. This aspect of complexity goes towards music’s ability to borrow from other domains, while simultaneously achieving its own goals as seen here.

²⁴ D’Alembert, *Réflexions sur la musique*, in *QB*, 1647.

²⁵ Rameau’s influence is felt in this characterization of music as limited to sounds. This does not completely evacuate performance aspects from D’Alembert’s theoretical writings on music, but it is an indication that he is less reticent than some of the other members of the *coin de la reine* to consider pure music.

²⁶ See Cicero, *De Oratore*. In a letter to his brother (*Letters to Brutus*, 61) the thinker even forecasts the debate between line and color, wishing for both in the ideal text. Concerning painting itself, Cicero insists on education, noting that once an artist has learned to paint a certain type of subject, he can then easily paint others of that particular variety (*De Oratore*, 239). As applied to music, the quarrel’s participants seem to take away from this lesson both the importance of this educational aspect and its limits: knowledge of technique allows for musical production but does not make the latter good. Like eloquence, music needs to evolve beyond good technique.

intelligent or enlightening a choice.²⁷ Although painting is closer to nature as well as to Latin and Greek (“la peinture est souvent morte et inanimée,”²⁸ writes Rousseau—the parallel to *langues mortes* in a book that deals with “l’origine des langues” being unmistakable), music is closer to all of these in their conceptual and evolved forms, and this enriches its relationship with eloquence: music, like reasoned debate, is part of what forms the essence of humanity. Thus, within its relationship with eloquence, music is a reflection of what ancient Greek would be if it were still a *langue vivante*, just as the *querelle* itself seeks to be a great rhetorical debate. This contention is mapped directly on the quarrel of the Ancients and Moderns, the *Anciens* led by Boileau having espoused a primitivism that sought a return to ancient ideals and viewed primitive man as closest to poetic and artistic sources. So, Rousseau’s aforementioned Armenian of Venice—mirrored in the French conception of women—represents a modernized version of this sort of primitivism. Yet, while they value nature’s raw state, the Italianists require an intermediary in the form of a foreign element that enables this return to antiquity, while the partisans of French music’s support of Rameau’s harmonic innovations is also accomplished through a lens—that of French classicism. So, for both sides, there is a conscious transformation that is operated through an intermediary, much as eloquence is being transferred to the written form. Music itself—and its impact—is also considered in this fashion, through its relation to other arts: a comparison of music and painting is one of the ways music’s special qualities are confirmed. Not only is music able to speak on a different level from painting, it is also the more interesting of the two arts (“l’une intéresse plus que l’autre,” above, p. 127) and brings us closer

²⁷ The idea of presenting what is not there is central to Rousseau’s idea of music and the *querelle* itself. Chapter 4 examines this idea of a subtext particularly suited to a musical debate.

²⁸ Rousseau, *Essai sur l’origine des langues*, 116.

to defining ourselves—characteristics that are uncovered through music’s relationship with eloquence.

In fact, it is precisely music’s differences with painting that make it invaluable. It may not be as precise in its depictions as painting but it is uniquely forceful in producing desired emotions, and this is where eloquence can learn from it. Music excels at evoking a certain frame of mind—going beyond affects to include an intellectual component—for thinkers such as D’Alembert: “Ainsi, les sons harmoniques ne peuvent pas peindre le sentiment, mais ils peuvent en réveiller l’idée, et mettre l’âme dans l’état où l’on suppose qu’est celle du personnage qu’on fait agir; et c’est même, de tous les moyens qu’elle emploie pour émouvoir, celui qui produit le plus sûrement cet effet.”²⁹ Once again, music clearly achieves something beyond what any painting can. The extent to which music is able to use *pathos* is evident in the indication that the listener can be made to have the same disposition as the character “qu’on fait agir.” This last word implies that music can in fact lead to specific moods that in turn elicit particular actions, proving Italian music uniquely positioned to pass this ultimate test of eloquence.

Both quintessentially humanistic disciplines, music and eloquence hold positions of privilege that Rousseau and the *coin de la reine* position as fulfilling slightly-modified version of the shared rhetorical goals that bind them together: *docere* (their intellectual qualities and ability to address abstractions), *delectare* (their capacity to reveal our humanity) and *movere* (their common effect on the soul). Without a doubt, for the partisans of Italian music, the last of these qualities is the one whose effect is the most profound in both effective rhetoric and good music, and it is best achieved through a strong dose of *pathos*. Thus, D’Alembert writes in his *De la*

²⁹ D’Alembert, *Réflexions sur la musique*, in *QB*, 1652.

Liberté de la musique—not once but twice—that “L’opéra est donc le spectacle des sens, et ne saurait être autre chose.”³⁰ This uncontestedly limits music to a certain extent as, for D’Alembert, music’s *only* means of affecting is through the senses, but it also therefore justifies using *pathos* to the utmost. At the same time as it is limited to a specific outlet, music’s real—even if “only”—power is revealed in the clear indication that impacting the senses in this manner is in fact extremely important.³¹ Even the measured Diderot sees musical *pathos* as evidence of authenticity and success: music is able to elicit visceral reactions that lead to action in a way only matched by eloquent discourse.³² The concept serves as a response to the constant accusations of excess coming from the other side:³³ for the *coin de la reine*, there is no such thing as excess in music because the most violent and forceful expressions are part of its constitution, just as they are for eloquence. Italian music is “une langue *de charge*”³⁴ different from regular language, meant expressly for expressing deep emotions and passions, and its “*récitatif obligé*” (intended for big emotions) is able to seduce even those who do not appreciate ordinary Italian recitative. Italian music’s force is therefore perfectly synchronous with the violence deemed necessary for

³⁰ D’Alembert, *De la Liberté de la musique*, in *QB*, 2224.

³¹ Once again, the contrast between music and painting supports the argument: “La Musique se propose pour but, **non-seulement** de peindre, mais encore d’émouvoir,” writes D’Alembert (my emphasis), *Réflexions sur la musique*, in *QB*, 1661. The author clearly places a higher value on music’s ability and responsibility to fulfill the goal of *movere* than on painting’s descriptive nature.

³² In *Les Trois Chapitres, ou la vision de la nuit du mardi-gras au mercredi des cendres*, in *QB*, 499, Diderot depicts good use of *pathos* as proof of the depicted emotions’ authenticity. He then goes on to describe the persuasive force of music and text combined as evidenced in the reactions of his “petit prophète” (503), who is so moved that he is lead to speak to the characters of the opera he is watching, as well as utter exclamations. The deep emotions and desire to act instilled in the protagonist by this music is achieved through an equality between eloquent discourse and good music.

³³ This critique is analyzed in the second part of this chapter. D’Alembert later terms Italian recitative “un genre moyen entre le chant et le discours,” *De la Liberté de la musique*, in *QB*, 2234, further underscoring his desire to debunk the belief that Italian music—and his *coin*’s argumentation—is prone to excess. Its strong use of *pathos* and resulting force are not to be confused with its form.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 2242.

eloquence to be truly convincing, and this is what allows it to move to action. Thus, if the *coin du roi* fails to implement good *pathos* and reach music's aim of *movere*, it can make equal and balanced use of any of the other attributes it has available but will still ultimately be deemed a failure.

An inability to move in the other *coin*

The importance of *pathos* is most vigorously argued through a depiction of its waning status on the other side. This is evident in the opposition of Ancients and Moderns, which no longer forms the discussion's armature as it had in previous debates but nevertheless remains an important duality. Rousseau's simple but necessary positing of two camps is fundamentally conceived with this tried and true opposition in mind and helps establish the quarrel's rhetorical dimension. Thus, in a key passage at the end of the second part of his *Lettre sur la musique française*, Rousseau draws attention to "nos compositions modernes," in which "plus notre musique se perfectionne en apparence, et plus elle se gâte en effet."³⁵ In so doing, Rousseau places the partisans of Italian music on the side of the Ancients, in stark opposition with the Moderns represented by Rameau's supporters.³⁶ By depicting modern innovation—or the appearance thereof—as the culmination of bad habits, Rousseau both points to larger social issues and alludes once again to his proclivity towards primitivism, in the sense that Italian music reclaims the very soul of music through its ability to see past the fog of French musical practices.

³⁵ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 169. It is immediately following this depiction that Rousseau constructs his theory of the simultaneous opposition and amalgamation of Rameau (for the moment represented by the concept of modern French music) and Lully, as examined in Chapter 3.

³⁶ As seen in Chapter 4 and mentioned in Chapter 1, the *coin du roi* is less systematically organized than the *coin de la reine*, making classifications more difficult. The fact that the *querelle des bouffons* is no longer organized precisely around Ancients and Moderns—even though the opposition is important and present throughout (see p. 149)—also allows the French side to be less bound by its overall embrace of the modern side.

By adding that it is the “théoricien”³⁷—not the listener or musician—who must explain the causes of good music, Rousseau laments the fact that French music requires explanation to reveal its merits. Far from being simplistic, Italian music is nevertheless able to reconnect with its listener on a fundamental level, much as eloquence was able to do in the way it permeated all facets of ancient Greece. As we will see in the final chapter, it is this connection that has been lost by French composers, whose quest to refine their art in a myopic, internalized fashion that ignores all outside influences (once again pointing to the foreign as a positive element) has resulted in complete decadence, rather than cultural progress. The essence of Rousseau’s argument against French music in this instance is based on this opposition and the notion that his opponents’ advantages are illusory: although modern music may have the appearance of genuine *ethos*, it is in fact an artificial assemblage of flashy techniques that cannot have a strong impact on its audience. Arnaud—who collaborated with Fréron and goes on to become one of the heads of the *glukistes* in the subsequent *querelle des piccinistes et des glükistes*—uses Quintilian and other ancient sources to demonstrate that the French quest for reason has been detrimental to its music and, in particular, its impact on the listener.³⁸ At least in part, this is due to having become so far removed from ancient roots that it is impossible to reclaim them. As seen in Chapter 1, the rigidity that ensues—an inability to move on more levels than one—results in French music’s isolation, leading Holbach to comment that “vous resterez à jamais, comme vous prétendrez

³⁷ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 169.

³⁸ In his *Lettre sur la Musique à M. le Comte de Caylus*, in Laborde, *Essai sur la Musique*, v. 3, 555, Arnaud notes that in ancient Greece, true ancient music started to vanish when “les plaisirs de la raison furent sacrifiés à ceux de l’oreille.” While somewhat counterintuitive in the apparent opposition of pleasure and reason, the statement goes towards Rousseau’s concept of “unité de mélodie” and the seductiveness of extraneous elements that overpower those that are essential.

l'être depuis longtemps, le plus singulier Orchestre du monde."³⁹ It is clear that what may have once made French music and performance style great has become their downfall, according to the *coin de la reine*'s conception of musical eloquence that is born out of an idealized vision of ancient precepts and privileges *pathos* as a means of responding to its partisans' expectations.

At least in part, the successful use of *pathos* to achieve the goal of *movere* is based in the deep moral grounding that binds eloquence and music. It is thus useful to look at Chapter 15 of the *Essai sur l'origine des langues*,⁴⁰ which seeks to demonstrate the moral aspects of music reflected in the force of *pathos* and its lack on the French side. The very existence of such a chapter helps explain the choice of music as the *querelle*'s *raison d'être*: what Rousseau sees as the deeply moral motivations of music, which form the "vrais principes de la musique,"⁴¹ are worthy of philosophical examination and lend validity to the topic selected by the quarrelers. Even more important, these motivations are reflective of the link between music and eloquence that so interests the *coin de la reine*. Music is more than a mere assemblage of sounds: "Les sons dans la mélodie n'agissent pas seulement sur nous comme sons, mais comme signes de nos affections, de nos sentiments."⁴² Here, the centrality of a rhetorical model for music is clear—and Rousseau goes beyond the affects in his careful wording: just like an eloquent speech, music

³⁹ Holbach, *Lettre à une dame d'un certain âge*, in *QB*, 128.

⁴⁰ Although it is a post-quarrel text, the *Essai sur l'origine des langues* presents many theories concerning music that are largely based on—and adhere to the principles of—those developed by Rousseau during the quarrel proper (and particularly in his *Lettre sur la musique française*), rendering them relevant for our purposes. (The importance of music in the *Essai* is paramount, to the point that Rousseau cites the work in Book IV of *L'Emile* as *Principe de la mélodie*, a title that stems from the preliminary versions of the text, which led to the final subtitle "où il est parlé de la mélodie et de l'imitation musicale.") The work is dated to the early 1760s by Duchez and Wokler, as noted by Michael O'Dea in "Rousseau contre Rameau: musique et nature dans les articles pour l'Encyclopédie et au-delà," 133.

⁴¹ Rousseau, *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, 111.

⁴² *Ibid.*

uses its effect to convey something significant.⁴³ Although Rousseau carefully ascribes this powerful role to melody, acknowledging such musical force seems dangerous until the reader realizes that the core of the argument resides in the idea that music's powerful moral aspect disproves Rameau's science-based theories. Indeed, Rousseau is discounting the physical aspects so dear to his opponent wherein sounds speak for themselves and, by integrating an aspect of moral motivation, is demonstrating that vibrations explain little or nothing of music's power. In essence, he is transferring music from the sciences back to the humanities.⁴⁴

Si le plus grand empire qu'ont sur nous nos sensations n'est pas dû à des causes morales, pourquoi donc sommes-nous si sensibles à des impressions qui sont nulles pour des barbares? Pourquoi nos plus touchantes musiques ne sont-elles qu'un vain bruit à l'oreille d'un Caraïbe?⁴⁵

Contradicting his own principles from the quarrel (whereby Italian music was superior because it had universal appeal), Rousseau uses the arguments of French musicians against their leader: if Rameau's music is effective, it is not due to its underlying harmonic and vibratory foundations but because of music's moral nature. Therefore, Rameau's entire worldview is deeply flawed and the reasons for the validity of his own music misattributed. Rousseau then explains that there is an essential division of the physical and sensual on one side, and the intellectual and moral on the other. The linking of the two is accomplished through a rhetorical system, which gives power to words and melodies:

⁴³ In both cases, this act of translation is mirrored in a written form, the significance of which is discussed in Chapter 4.

⁴⁴ Rousseau can in fact be said to have shown music to be one of the most essentially human of arts, as mentioned further on in this Chapter. In particular, see the passage concerning the comparison of music and painting, p. 157.

⁴⁵ Rousseau, *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, 111.

[c'est une] erreur de donner aux objets sensibles un pouvoir qu'ils n'ont pas ou qu'ils tiennent des affectations de l'âme qu'ils nous représentent.⁴⁶

This idea of representation involves a translation from its original moral source to the physical (words and sounds) and back to the moral (eloquence and music).⁴⁷ The relationship between music and rhetoric is reinforced as Rousseau continues:

Des suites de sons ou d'accords m'amuseront un moment peut-être; mais pour me charmer et m'attendrir, il faut que ces suites m'offrent quelque chose qui ne soit ni son ni accord, et qui vienne émouvoir malgré moi. Les chants qui ne sont qu'agréables et ne disent rien lassent encore; car ce n'est pas tant l'oreille qui porte le plaisir au cœur, que le cœur qui le porte à l'oreille.⁴⁸

To reach their shared goals, eloquence and music must bring to life sentiments and motivations that already exist within their listeners or readers. To this end, *ethos* and *pathos* are both key: in music, as in in the moral model it borrows from eloquence, there cannot be one without the other. There is a sense that Rameau's very theories are what lead to his bad music. Just as ordinary speech is no match for true eloquence, Rameau's motivation is wrong and his musical production therefore cannot achieve the highest level.

So, although pleasure remains music's primary function for many theorists, it is not the art's only purpose, nor the one that makes it unique. For Rousseau, French composers miss the mark by failing to embrace music's full force in its fusion with eloquence through *pathos*, thus reducing it to a watered-down form unworthy of even being called music.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 112.

⁴⁷ It is interesting that this rapport involves a sort of otherness, which could be thought of as foreignness, an element that permeates Rousseau's quarrel writings, as explored in Chapter 1.

⁴⁸ Rousseau, *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, 113.

While music clearly uses rhetoric as its model, it also has an impact on the latter: in addition to illustrating the deficiencies of French music, Rousseau's attack reflects the degradation of notions central to eloquence. Similarly, D'Alembert points out that French opera's boring recitatives find no compensation in the equally uninspired—and uninspiring—airs. In using the term “dédommager,”⁴⁹ he brings to mind economic questions—a recurring theme, often used by the *coin du roi* to attack Rousseau and his cohorts for their lowly motivations—and music's *decorum* thus seems based on a sort of fair trade and the idea of getting one's due, which French opera miserably fails to provide and that a full dose of *pathos* satisfies. The very cohesiveness of the French genre contributes to this perception, as the consistency defended by the *coin du roi* becomes its biggest downfall: “Le chant Français a le défaut le plus contraire à l'expression; c'est de se ressembler toujours à lui-même. La douleur et la joie, la fureur et la tendresse y ont le même style.”⁵⁰ Such lack of variation is presented in this instance as primarily problematic because monotony results in a breach of appropriate expression, due to which what is being articulated and the manner in which it is being conveyed are indefensibly at odds. So, interestingly, both thinkers go about deploring through music's lack of *pathos* the state of the rhetorical precept of *decorum*, fully aware that the notion forms the epicenter of their opponents' responses. In fact, the *coin de la reine* seeks to deflect criticisms towards its perceived disavowal of *decorum* by pointing to its own lack in the French arena. This is seen in the French style's inclusion of an entertainment value, perhaps the only feature that could counteract its innate dullness—the latter itself being a breach of *decorum* in its failure to

⁴⁹ D'Alembert, *De la Liberté de la musique*, in *QB*, 2260.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 2264.

provide variation and to reach its full pleasure potential—,⁵¹ through the inappropriate use of “sauteurs” and “danseurs”—or, as Grimm puts it, “ces Sauteuses qui venaient interrompre la conversation de ces personnages, sans dire pourquoi”—⁵² that are in direct conflict with its tragic nature. These elements additionally interrupt what the partisans of Italian music see as the main event (the opera itself), resulting in a third breach of *decorum*. The *coin de la reine* therefore understands that its adversaries will use a particular conception of *decorum* to defend their own idea of music’s intent. In so doing, the French side reveals a different conception of music’s relationship to the fundamental principles of rhetoric.

II. The coin du roi's convergence of eloquence and music in bon goût

The *coin du roi* remains more restrained in the role it accords music than do the partisans of Italian music. Even for Rameau, who believes music to be all encompassing, its goal remains *delectare* above all else. For this reason, *decorum* takes on a very specific form and plays a particularly prominent role in the camp: what music must accomplish being narrowly defined, the way in which it does this is therefore relatively limited and centered fully on building a French notion of appropriateness. The French side thus responds to *pathos* as the epicenter of both eloquence and music with a notion of the disciplines’ relation that revolves instead around a form of *decorum* through moderation, which is the surest way to guarantee a steady correspondence of *verba* (style) to *res* (content) for its partisans. Although *decorum* is an essential notion for both sides, it rises to the forefront in the French camp. It is no surprise, then,

⁵¹ Among others, in *De la Liberté de la musique* (2243), D’Alembert reminds his reader that French opera is monotonous and lacking any sort of variety. After having established that foreigners are impartial, he adds that they are surprised by this aspect of French opera, implying that such monotony is unnatural.

⁵² *Le Petit Prophète de Boehmischbroda*, in *QB*, 153

that Fumaroli describes the notion as the traditional key to rhetoric, evoking Poussin's use of musical modes to explain the notion as the factor that provides a sense of "essence harmonique."⁵³ Not only does this tie into the French position on music (and particularly in the debate of melody versus harmony) but it also goes towards the *coin du roi*'s formation of a peculiarly-French definition of the notion that allows it to effectively counter Rousseau's attacks and find a unique place for its perception of the relationship between eloquence and music. Indeed, the supporters of French music see *decorum* as thoroughly tied to language and customs, ultimately constituting the very core of French *bon goût*. What the partisans of Italian music find boring and amusical is in fact the essence of French music's specificity, and its understanding requires an embrace of things French that goes beyond music—the lack of which demonstrates the other side's foreignness (whether or not actual foreigners are in question) and consequent inappropriateness for the French public.

Towards a definition of French *decorum*

Although it yields completely different results, the importance of *ethos* is central for the *coin du roi*, as it was for its opponents. The notion of *decorum* that allows for true *bon goût* is one founded on the values of the *grand siècle*, based on a sense that appropriateness that is translated through moderation and is an essentially moral obligation: French music's deliberateness is not slow and tedious but, rather, measured and reasonable—the perfect style for an educated, courtly audience. The notion is based on music's inscription in a long line of cultural traditions, which goes against the spontaneity offered on the other side and results in perceived lassitude. Thus, Estève and Morand assign the lack of understanding on the part of the

⁵³ Fumaroli, *L'Âge de l'éloquence*, xiv.

coin de la reine to a parallel, fundamental lack of Frenchness in their camp. They suggest that Rousseau must learn “la déclamation tragique”⁵⁴ in order to appreciate French opera, linking the latter to its foundations in the *théâtre classique* and insisting on the equal balance of principles, including *actio* and *elocutio*, that make up their measured view of good music as revolving around *decorum*.

The question of the reading and listening public is especially important for the *coin du roi*, and is closely linked to this concept of *decorum*. In his *Observations sur la Lettre de J.J. Rousseau* (published less than a month following Rousseau’s letter, in December 1753), Jacques Cazotte espouses *decorum* in the proper choice of musical forms, concluding that French recitative is appropriately based on French declamation and is thus, no matter what Rousseau claims, the appropriate choice for French opera. Cazotte calls this “plaisir de convention.”⁵⁵ good music, like good speech, must use the techniques appropriate to affecting its intended audience. This allows partisans of French music to declare that the themes and style of their opera—rejected by Rousseau—are in fact well suited to the “sentiments nobles et élevés” of its intended

⁵⁴ Estève and Morand, *Justification de la musique française. Contre la querelle qui lui a été faite par un Allemand et un Allobroge. Adressée par elle-même au coin de la reine le jour qu’avec Titon et l’Aurore elle s’est remise en possession de son théâtre*, 1136.

⁵⁵ Cazotte, *Observations sur la Lettre de J.J. Rousseau, au sujet de la musique française*, in *QB*, 848.

audience.⁵⁶ By implication, Rousseau will never be part of this audience, and a logical correlation is established between his criticism of French opera and his status as a foreigner. If “l’oreille ne peut trouver de satisfaction à suivre une fugue sur un beau dessein,”⁵⁷ then perhaps the ear in question does not belong to the intended recipient and cannot—without undergoing a form of reeducation—appreciate the composition in question. To reinforce his point, Cazotte calls on those who are charmed by French music to serve as witnesses. It is therefore perfectly reasonable for the author to show an appreciation of Italian music⁵⁸ without ever visibly being moved by it to any real extent. Thus, the concept of adaptability frequently used by the *coin du roi*’s opponents as a means of attack is turned on its head with the notion that it may be the spectators, rather than the music, that are narrow minded.

In fact, a narrow focus in music, as in the French vision of eloquence, can be a boon. Evidence of this is seen in Cazotte’s qualification of Italian music as quite enjoyable and “propre à tout.”⁵⁹ Far from being a compliment, this characterization points to Italian music as being overly general and trying to please too many people, which results in a lack of effectiveness. The

⁵⁶ *Ibid.* This is a recurrent theme in *coin du roi* texts, which place a high value on authenticity as the reason French music is appropriate. For Jean-Baptiste Jourdan, the quarrel’s “ridicule distinction” between French and Italian music (which can be questioned in this fashion because the pamphlet is from the debate’s early phase) is pointless precisely because the two styles are bound, through their allegiance to the precepts of eloquence, to produce operas that reflect their sources of inspiration—which is to say their linguistic bases. For the *coin du roi*, this means French music will necessarily be slower and “plus noble et plus majestueuse” than its Italian equivalent (“vif, tendre, léger”). See Jourdan, *Le Correcteur des bouffons à l’écolier de Prague*, in *QB*, 197-198. In contrast, the differences are due to a comparison that is flawed at its core for the *coin de la reine*: two completely different styles are being compared. While some thinkers including Diderot call for an accurate comparison of *tragédie lyrique* to *opera seria*, most believe that there is no choice but to compare French tragic opera to Italian comedies because the French public does not have access to *opere serie*. This is used as an additional point in favor of Italian music since, even in its comical form, Italian opera is far closer to the *coin de la reine*’s ideals than French opera can ever hope to be.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 853.

⁵⁸ “Elle est simple, agréable, légère, malléable, fusible,” writes Cazotte, *Ibid.*, 852.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

latter is visible in the *coin du roi*'s rebuttals of Rousseau's claim of necessary variation within the *recitative* itself:

Nous possédons un Spectacle où plusieurs arts agréables sont réunis par tous les rapports qu'ils peuvent avoir ensemble. Les Divertissements liés au sujet sont donc animés par l'intérêt qui doit régner dans tout l'Ouvrage. Le grand nombre de Chœurs oblige le Musicien de posséder l'Art de joindre le Chant à la plus brillante harmonie.⁶⁰

In contrast, "Les Opéra Italiens ne sont qu'un mélange uniforme de Récitatifs et d'ariettes." For the partisans of French music, variation is found in the alternation of different musical forms. The point gains traction as the quarrel progresses, through the *coin*'s defense of Rameau's harmonic principles, and confirms the fundamental difference in the two sides' view of the relationship between eloquence and music. While the *coin de la reine* seeks variation within each recitative or aria, the partisans of French music favor a variety of distinct musical forms that remain true to their individual forms and thus offer less internal variation. As it was for the opposite side, music is thus once again used to demonstrate and inform good eloquence, this time based on *decorum*: written arguments must be focused and true to their form from beginning to end, while the different approaches used by each contributor will allow for different readers to be reached. Trying to reach every reader within one text as Rousseau does is too ambitious and leads to his overall weakening.

Finally, for the *coin du roi*, the concept of *decorum* presupposes the proper and equal valuation of all of music's components, even if (or perhaps because) this encourages a certain level of difficulty. This view reflects the higher emphasis placed by the partisans of French

⁶⁰ Rulhière, *Jugement de l'orchestre de l'opéra*, in *QB*, 442.

music on technical aspects of eloquence and music (especially in the first phase of the quarrel) than on the other side. For the *coin du roi*, technique is a large part of an art and has nothing to do with the frivolous, fast and easy shortcuts employed in the other camp. Moreover, Rulhière indicates that the fact Italian songs can be properly sung by pretty much anyone is proof of their inherent flaws, while the demanding nature of French recitative is indicative of the composers' hard work. This idea further reinforces the relationship of music and eloquence in the perception of French compositional and performance practices, emphasizing the use of techniques (despite the many claims to the contrary) and the importance of *actio*. Just as eloquent speeches can only be truly successful if given (or written) by the best orators (or authors), French opera requires a strong degree of talent on the part of its musicians. Interestingly, this talent is not easily acquired (though de Rulhière indicates it can be fostered through proper education): "dans la Musique Française, il faut du sentiment; le travail ne le donne pas, il ne sert qu'à en former l'expression."⁶¹ *Pathos* is therefore also important but it is not the sole objective, nor is it effortlessly attainable. Once again, this places a high value on *ingenium*, combined with a long, proper education that provides the tools for both creating and understanding music. In a sense, French music's high degree of difficulty means cheap tricks cannot be used to create pleasure and achieve persuasion; the latter requires a high degree of talent on the part of performers and authors, acquired through years of education, as opposed to the mere application of tricks on the Italian side. In this style, the musicians must be fully invested and possess all faculties of the soul. Only then, can the ideal form be achieved: "la bonne Musique sera celle qui unira le plus

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 443.

parfaitement les agréments artificiels du chant, au ton naturel de la déclamation...”⁶² Such a union can only be achieved through the equal valuation of all the components, each technique or “agrément artificiel” finding its morality in its full and proper execution, allowing for the elaboration of a type of speech that is natural to the operatic form. The idea of *decorum* therefore links music to all of the aspects of eloquence, requiring the full participation of every actor, each fulfilling its specific role and thus preventing too much power from being attributed to any one person or component.

Eloquence and music as a critique of excess

If *pathos* is also important for the *coin du roi*, its relevance is based on a different conception of how it should be used. To this point, the Père Castel notes the way in which Italian music “donne tout à la force du sentiment,” which allows it to completely overwhelm the listener and seems to result in the loss of other important qualities. Conversely, French music focuses on “l’esprit et le cœur purement spirituel,”⁶³ which implies that *pathos* is used to achieve morally-superior goals. Since most people are “plus corps qu’esprit,”⁶⁴ French music may sometimes not be effective in the way Italian music is (through its undeniably strong impact) but this speaks to its qualities, not its flaws: for Castel, French music is a masterful speech that is misunderstood because the audience is unable to fully grasp its eloquence. So, for the *coin du roi*, *pathos* is an ingredient like the others, to be used in measured doses—and French music’s failures are due to

⁶² V.T.H.S.V.M., in *QB*, *Lettre de M. M... du coin du roi, à MM. du coin de la reine, sur la nouvelle pièce, intitulée La Servante Maîtresse*, in *QB*, 2179.

⁶³ Castel, *Lettres d’un Académicien de Bordeaux sur le fonds de la Musique*, in *QB*, 1434.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

a lack of capacity or adaptability on the part of the listeners—,⁶⁵ which should not be overused simply to ensure the audience feels the music's intended impact. One could even say that Castel turns the French style's perceived lack of effectiveness into a point of pride, just as were its slowness and other such aspects mentioned earlier. Thus, there is a real sense that the public has been adversely affected by Italian music, its senses numbed by the overwhelming force of Italian opera and leading to a lack of appreciation of its French counterpart

Little by little, the *coin du roi*'s perception of *pathos* evolves but Castel's idea that its opponents give it too much weight remains a leitmotiv.⁶⁶ Thus, in his *Observations sur la Lettre de J.J. Rousseau*, Cazotte sees a lack of *decorum* in the reception of Italian music, due to a same lack in its production: "On peut faire en notre langue un bon Poème susceptible d'être mis en Musique, de manière qu'il en résulte pour la Nation un plaisir vif et raisonnable."⁶⁷ The combination of strong sentiments and reason pays homage to French classicism and the sense that the excessiveness of emotions expressed in response to—or perhaps even induced by—

⁶⁵ This acknowledgement of French music's lack of persuasiveness certainly could be seen as revealing a resistance to a full relationship between eloquence and music on the part of certain *coin du roi* theorists. However, the smaller role given to *pathos* is also a way of explaining French music's perceived ineffectiveness while acknowledging the existence of the relationship. It is often coupled with the idea that the latter must be adapted to modern times and not simply aspire to recreate ancient ideals. In this sense, French music is not so much ineffective as it is balanced, reasoned and evolved.

⁶⁶ Rameau is an exception to this trend, mostly because he focuses almost exclusively on purely musical considerations, while the other theorists (regardless of their *coin*) are more interested in perceptions of music and other correlations. For Rameau—much like the *coin de la reine*—music's awesome power over the soul lies in a privileged relationship with eloquence that places *pathos* above all else. Despite numerous claims to the contrary from the opposing side, French music is all about sentiment for the composer: "Si l'imitation des bruits et des mouvements n'est pas aussi fréquemment employée dans notre Musique que dans l'Italienne, c'est que l'objet dominant de la nôtre est le sentiment," *Observations sur notre instinct pour la musique et sur son principe*, in *QB*, 1736. As a point of confirmation, Rameau opposes the "expression du Physique" to "celle du Pathétique," *Ibid.*, 1738, with the latter clearly detaining a privileged position that places *pathos* in the realm of harmony and helps reinforce the supremacy of the latter over melody. This distancing from music's traditional role of imitation is therefore justified through the relationship of eloquence and music, and goes hand in hand with the idea of French music being nobler than its Italian equivalent. (See footnotes 3 and 56 for an exploration of this element of nobility in French music.)

⁶⁷ Cazotte, *Observations sur la Lettre de J.J. Rousseau*, in *QB*, 846.

Italian music is inappropriate and very much un-French.⁶⁸ This is due to the faddish nature of Italian opera⁶⁹ but also to a fundamental flaw in its lack of measure, resulting in such strong *pathos* that *logos* and *ethos* are all but obliterated.⁷⁰ For the *coin du roi*, both music and eloquence must retain a balance in which *pathos* cannot overtake the other proofs. As was alluded to earlier, one of the quarrel's recurring themes is summed up by Rochemont: the force of real French music lies in its moderation, while Italian music—and indeed its partisans' thought process—are guilty of “excessive fertilité.”⁷¹ Ozy cites Rousseau's description of Italian operas as having an incommensurable and disproportionate impact on the soul (“[ils] déchireront ou raviront l'âme, nous mettront hors de nous-mêmes, et nous arracheront des cris dans nos transports”) and goes on to describe this impact as “ces effets merveilleux” with an irony that

⁶⁸ As is the case with several pamphlets from the *coin du roi*, Jourdan illustrates this in *Le Correcteur des bouffons*, in *QB*, 201, by repeatedly using “fureur” as a pejorative indication of the other side's excesses: “la fureur de tout Italianiser, et dans la composition, et dans l'Art du Chant.” Here, the problem is depicted at its worse, having infiltrated French musical practices through a form of *pathos* that tosses reason by the wayside, and emphasizing the foreign element examined in Chapter 1.

⁶⁹ Treating Italian music as something temporarily popular is a common technique in the *coin du roi*. For example, Rulhière wants to prevent music from being “asservie au caprice des modes” in his *Jugement de l'orchestre de l'opéra*, in *QB*, 441. Often, this idea is coupled with a sense that the *coin de la reine* lacks *ethos*. Thus, the French side repeatedly presents Italian music as a fad that makes use of false arguments and is therefore falsely appealing: “le faux goût, à l'aide de la mode, peut aveugler pour un temps, la Nation la plus polie, la plus spirituelle, et peut-être la plus aimable de l'Europe, même de l'aveu des autres; c'est une fausse lumière qui l'égare...” writes Jourdan in *Le Correcteur des bouffons*, in *QB*, 196. In this passage, the motivations behind music mirror those of argumentative discourse and the play on the word “lumière” attacks both the appeal of Italian music and the validity of the arguments—and even perhaps the most fundamental reasoning—proffered by the other side. See Chapter 4.

⁷⁰ For the French side, *decorum* must contain a good dose of *ethos*, and excess is seen as morally inappropriate. This applies both to eloquence and music, with the former serving as a model for the latter in terms of morality. In his *Lettre sur celle de M. J.J. Rousseau, citoyen de Genève, sur la musique*, in *QB*, 871, Etienne Ozy depicts Rousseau as “allant toujours au-delà de la vérité” and “outré dans ses jugements,” which means he cannot be trusted. Similarly, his satirical portrait of French music as necessarily failing because it is not excessive and decadent enough leads Ozy to conclude that its supporters engage in judgment that is “trop modéré.” In this instance, excess leads to spurious conclusions (because there is obviously no such thing as too much moderation).

⁷¹ The *coin du roi* does not deny the creativity found on the other side and its best recourse seems to be revealing the lack of control embodied by this “fertilité,” linking it to the concepts of foreignness and savageness. Rochemont, *Réflexions d'un patriote sur l'opéra français et sur l'opéra italien, qui présentent le parallèle du goût des deux nations dans les beaux arts*, in *QB*, 2125.

could not be deeper.⁷² For the *coin du roi*, music in its relationship with eloquence must not be so excessive as to render its listener completely oblivious to reason. While this effect is admired by the *coin de la reine*, for the supporters of French music it reveals unacceptable excess that takes society back to uncivilized times and thus negates all the progress that has been made⁷³—once again using the quarrel of the Ancients and Moderns as a blueprint and emphasizing modernity in its contrast to the other side’s embrace of primitivism. It is because of this that the partisans of Italian music are incapable of *bon goût*. Indeed, their lack of reason is a result of their excess, as is their perplexing lack of appreciation towards Rameau and Mondonville. This leads Rousselet to exclaim concerning Rousseau: “Quelle déraison et quel renversement d’idées !”⁷⁴ Clearly, the *coin de la reine*’s ideas are more than just innovative, they are unreasonable in their lack of measure, the very opposite of courtly taste. Just as Italian music is depicted as too forceful, Rousseau is recognized as a renegade, which is not a virtuous quality when it comes to debating because it necessarily implies a form of imbalance that goes beyond the unseemly to affect a thinker’s very core.

This effect of the “merveilleux” as opposed to the “vraisemblance” favored by the French side not only supports the notion of *decorum* being opposed to excess, it also brings back into

⁷²Ozy, *Lettre sur celle de M. J.J. Rousseau*, 880.

⁷³ The comparison of France to America drawn by Ozy at the beginning of the letter, with its fictional addressee, can be explained in this light. *Ibid.*, 863-865. Some commentators take an even harder line, indicating that the very idea of achieving *pathos* in music is inappropriate, compounding the error of their opponents’ over-valuation of the effect. Thus, while music can enable its listener to be receptive and ready—which could well be the most difficult task in achieving eloquence—, it cannot actually produce *pathos*: “Je ne disconviens pas que la Musique ne dispose l’âme aux passions; mais elle ne les exprime ni ne les peint,” writes Fréron (*Suite des lettres sur la musique française. En réponse à celle de Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, in *QB* 1027), further explaining that “ce sera plutôt une disposition aux passions qu’elle [l’âme] éprouvera, que les passions mêmes” (*Ibid.*, 1028). Others in the *coin du roi*—not the least of whom is Rameau—disagree with this notion that minimizes music’s impact. Nevertheless, the way in which the other side is seen as forgoing *decorum* to the utmost is palpable throughout the *coin*’s writings.

⁷⁴ Rousselet or Fréron, *Lettres sur la musique française. En réponse à celle de Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, in *QB*, 777.

play the quarrel of the Ancients and Moderns by referencing the sublime, traditionally favored by the Ancients and consequently linked to the Italianists' disproportionate reliance on *pathos* through their embrace of the concept. It is a rather unexpected differentiation because the “merveilleux” is precisely a key component of French *tragédie lyrique*'s believability—constituting a form of reality (or realness) within the specific, closed realm of the operatic genre—but, here, the term is used to indicate that the *coin de la reine*—as with everything else—has concocted its own definition of the “merveilleux,” which is no longer restrained and internally appropriate to its productions. Rather, its definition takes on a meaning that is similar to our current understanding of the term in its extreme quality, linked closely to the subsequent use of the term “déraison.” For the *coin du roi*, the use of *pathos* must be appropriate, as noted by Marin: “La Musique Française a des beautés qui la rendent supérieure à la Musique Italienne. C'est une Musique de sentiment. Elle peint les passions, et les inspire.”⁷⁵ This is clearly a retort to Rousseau and his partisans, attesting to the fact that French music can also be effective. As we have seen, its essence conventionally lies in *le beau* (“des beautés”), not *le sublime*, although Marin does also go on to mention the latter: “Les Italiens n'ont rien de comparable à la sublimité de nos chœurs.”⁷⁶ The difference seems to be in the use of the sublime, which is accepted in small doses and for very specific purposes (such as the “chœurs,” which unsurprisingly achieve their sublime force thanks to their harmonic structure). This allows it to contribute to the overall measured beauty of French music, rather than saturating its entire production as in the case of the Italian genre. It also points out the multileveled excess on the other side: the partisans of Italian

⁷⁵ Marin, *Ce qu'on dit, ce qu'on a voulu dire: Lettre à Madame Folio, marchande de brochures dans la Place du vieux Louvre*, 478.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*

music are too eager and too quick both in terms of their music (which lacks the depth afforded French music through its deliberate pace) and their use of *pathos* to achieve *movere*. Indeed, Jourdan reveals that “le vrai beau” in fact achieves much of what the sublime strives to do: “Le vrai beau saisit d’abord, ravit, enchante le Roi comme le Berger. Un Artiste habile et intelligent travaille pour tout le monde ; il trouve le moyen de satisfaire à la fois et les oreilles savantes et les oreilles vulgaires...”⁷⁷ The notion of a multifaceted approach that must be persuasive, have broad appeal and be widely accessible is very close to the Italian perspective but maintains its specificity by remaining imbued with a sense of Frenchness (“le Roi” must not be forgotten and *delectare* remains the main objective) and by demonstrating that restraint can achieve these results (resorting to the sublime being unnecessary). The centrality of a measured *decorum* in this camp is therefore never at bay, as can be seen in the progression of genres described by Jourdan in his consideration of the sublime: “la Déclamation, le Plainchant, la Musique Française, et la Musique qu’on appelle Italienne, et que j’appelle simplement la Musique.”⁷⁸ This crescendo acknowledges the universality of Italian music (“que j’appelle simplement la Musique”)—as well as its excessive quality, in its position at the very top of the construct being erected—and uses this admission to both make it less special in its very universality, as well as to favor a slight scaling down that brings to mind the idea that the *beau*—also one notch below the top of the pyramid—is more decorous than the *sublime*. From this perspective, Italian music lacks the specificity of its French counterpart (going towards the idea of positive narrowness mentioned earlier. French music achieves a higher status through diminution rather than

⁷⁷ Jourdan, *Le Correcteur des bouffons*, in *QB*, 209.

⁷⁸ Jourdan, *Lettre critique et historique sur la musique française, la musique Italienne, et sur les bouffons à Madame D...*, 453.

amplification, forming a counterintuitive link to traditional perceptions of eloquence. For the *coin du roi*, music is best when it does not forget its responsibilities (which include restraint and specificity) by giving in to the impulse of winning by overwhelming its listeners. The French approach may therefore be more difficult and initially less evidently successful but it unquestionably yields the best results when viewed from this angle. There is value in *not* having mass appeal, stemming from a notion of *decorum* born out of French classicism that attacks the sublime through the Italian side's reliance on excess in every facet of its music. This allows for a modification of precepts from the quarrel of the Ancients and Moderns that lends support the opposition of *decorum* and excess, leading to the critical statements examined earlier and nicely summed up by Jourdan: "Chez les Italiens tout conduit au grand..."⁷⁹

Similarly, not only is dismissing as absurd the idea of putting French words to Italian music a preemptive measure against what may be suggested as a compromise by the other side, it is also an indication of the necessity of *logos* in establishing a coherent musical form, and an implicit application of rhetorical principles. Rulhière addresses this when he notes that "Il faut donc un grand art pour ne prendre des Italiens que ce qui pourrait nous appartenir aussi bien qu'à eux. Leur Musique doit prêter quelques ornements à la nôtre, mais elle ne doit pas en altérer la beauté."⁸⁰ Cohesiveness and *logos* are indeed central to the French perception of *decorum*, as illustrated by Jourdan in his depiction of the ridiculous incoherence on the other side: the *bouffons* are "ces Bouffons qui ne sont point Bouffons" and Italian operas are "des Opéra

⁷⁹ *Ibid*, 460.

⁸⁰ Rulhière, *Jugement de l'orchestre de l'opéra*, in *QB*, 442.

Comiques, *qui ne sont point comiques*.”⁸¹ Such confusion in music is unforgiveable because, as in good speech, good music must be true to itself and use techniques appropriately adapted to its form. As a response to the foreign themes in the *coin de la reine*, Rulhière is careful to indicate that integrating foreign elements that are not authentic to French music amounts to a misappropriation within music’s embodiment of eloquence, just as Rousseau and his cohorts make inappropriate use of eloquence to write about music. In both instances, using improper tools yields poor results.⁸² Because of this, Rousseau’s *Lettre* and the Italian music that inspires it are perfectly matched, the one mirroring the other in their common absurdity and extravagance, which leads Caux de Cappeval to declare that “lui qui ne ressemblait à rien, ressemble maintenant à quelque chose.”⁸³ Although it yields a markedly negative result in this instance, the conception of eloquence and music as feeding off one another is clearly a natural, unavoidable phenomenon: before becoming fused, each of the two—in their Italian incarnations, that is—were literally nothing. In this sense, the amalgamation of their methods and aims is positive because it results in a production of some sort, even if it is bad. The problem is that, with such a high value placed on *pathos*—to the point of excess—, the other essential aspects of

⁸¹ Jourdan, *Le Correcteur des Bouffons*, in *QB*, 203. Later, the two inappropriate qualities meld resulting in the statement that “vos Bouffons ne sont ni Bouffons ni comiques,” 207.

⁸² The mixing of genres copied from Italian music does not suit French taste, while any form of hybrid solution is monstrous, as noted earlier and as repeated throughout the quarrel in characterizations like “cette Musique appliquée à des Paroles Françaises est une Musique ridicule,” V.T.H.S.V.M., in *QB*, *Lettre de M. M... du coin du roi, à MM. du coin de la reine*, 2181. On the textual side, the *coin de la reine* and Rousseau in particular fail to properly follow cultural norms, as seen in Chapter 1 through Rousseau’s repeated inability to properly address women—a profound, doubly-fatal flaw according to thinkers like Caste d’Arnobat, who point out both women’s weakness (which makes Rousseau a coward in his attacks—“il attaque les Dâmes dans leurs amusements”) and their position of authority, for it is “[les] Dâmes, qui ne se trompent jamais sur le goût” (making a fool of Rousseau for his repeated *faux pas*), *Doutes d’un pyrronnien*, in *QB*, 1004-1005. These flaws are amplified by the recurring presence of foreignness throughout the quarrel, but they also gain importance in the construction of a valid point of view for French music and for the *coin du roi*’s very argumentation. By situating *decorum* at the heart of both its music and its theory, the French side is able to show its adversaries to be the ones who are outside of what should constitute proper eloquence and good music.

⁸³ Caux de Cappeval, *Apologie du goût français*, in *QB*, 1571.

music are neglected. Even the act of creation and music's primary goal of pleasing are subjugated to the Italian need for quick and bold impact.

This allows Jourdan to find the sources of bad *actio* in the excessive nature of the other side's music itself, leading him to depict “[les] efforts réitérés que leur occasionne l’exécution d’une Musique bizarre dans les fibres du gosier qui se tendent et se détendent avec trop de violence, et de précipitation: ils ont donc remédié, comme on sait à ce défaut naturel par un expédient barbare, qui fait rougir la nature.” In such commentaries, the essence of what makes the foreign element explored in Chapter 1 deeply immoral is its excess, as reflected here in its musical production (for it is Italian music's inherently excessive use of *pathos* that has rendered its performers unable to express any form of subtlety without resorting to “trop de violence, et de précipitation”). Along these lines, Bâton le Jeune sees a reflection of excessive *pathos* in the brutality of Rousseau's prose:

Je ne conçois pas comment une plume comme celle de M. Rousseau, a pu s'abaisser au point d'employer l'invective. En supposant même qu'il eût raison, c'est se servir d'un mauvais moyen pour corriger les hommes, que de les choquer...⁸⁴

Shock, born out of *pathos* and the desire to move, is an excessive and underhanded technique that is portrayed as the main objective for both the *coin de la reine*'s music and its theories. Within the *coin du roi*'s rejection of Cicero's principle of violence, it is not justifiable under any circumstances and goes against the fundamentally moral aspects of *decorum*.

⁸⁴ Bâton le Jeune, *Examen de la Lettre de M. Rousseau sur la musique française. Dans lequel on expose le plan d'une bonne musique propre à notre langue*, 917.

The result of all of these reflections on excess helps explain the disdain expressed towards Italian music's simplicity—as matched by its supporters' written works—in a light other than a criticism of its intellectual lacunae. Indeed, it too is disproportionate and, as such, this extreme simplicity combines with excessive violence to form a terrible flaw that again harkens back to the foreign element in what is perceived as a recourse to barbarism, rather than an idealized form of primitivism. The Italianists have over-simplified both their music and their arguments to the point of becoming barbaric, which means they have no hope of incarnating either the ideals of eloquence or of good music. So, for the *coin du roi*, the relationship between eloquence and music centers on a notion of *decorum* defined through moderation and founded in the act of composition. Ultimately, this version of *decorum* born out of Frenchness itself is precisely what guarantees a form of pleasure perfectly suited to its audience,⁸⁵ which renders forsaking the precept not only unwise but unthinkable.

In essence, *pathos* can be achieved but solely through a type of *decorum* in which the only music appropriate for France is French music. In reaching this ideal form, eloquence further serves as a model for music through recitative, which—as is the case for the *coin de la reine* as well—is acknowledged as a central component of any opera. The specificity of a French form of recitative that relies on moderated *decorum* is visible in Cazotte's definition of the ideal “Scène”⁸⁶ as “propre à être récitée dans le goût que je viens de dire.”⁸⁷ Thanks to its Frenchness,

⁸⁵ Pleasure is by far music's most important goal for the partisans of French music, especially in the quarrel's first phase, but the other elements of eloquence make subtle appearances (for example, in the framing of the aforementioned rejection of a sort of hybrid form of French and Italian opera as lacking *logos* and breaching *ethos*) that become more prominent in the second phase.

⁸⁶ Paul-Marie Masson indicates in “La ‘Lettre sur Omphale’ (1752),” 7, that “scènes” commonly referred to the “dialogue récitatif” in French operas. This is confirmed in texts such as Rulhière's *Jugement de l'orchestre de l'opéra*, in *QB*, 443, in which French recitative and “scènes” are clearly synonymous.

⁸⁷ Cazotte, *Observations sur la Lettre de J.J. Rousseau*, in *QB*, 851.

“cette Scène ... excitera en nous autres Français un sentiment de plaisir plus vif que ne pourrait faire aucun autre spectacle dont nous ayons connaissance, et cependant nous en connaissons de bons.”⁸⁸ Despite its presentation as such, this point is not in contradiction with Rousseau’s *Lettre*.⁸⁹ It is in fact the essence of Rousseau’s boldly-put claim that the French can have no music: if the language on which it is based is flawed, French music cannot hope to be anything but flawed. So, French music’s *pathos* depends on a notion of *decorum* that privileges *logos* and *ethos*, relying on notions of moderation derived from such contrasts as the one between the *sublime* and the *beau* to emphasize its specificity—which places a high value on pleasure as seen here but, as noted earlier, also going beyond it to play a leading role in achieving *bon goût*—and oppose it to the other side’s flaws. Along these lines, one of the main criteria of *bon goût*, as shown by Kintzler,⁹⁰ can be found in a conception of music’s *vraisemblance* inherited from *tragédies classiques*. For the *coin du roi*, this concept helps define the notion of *decorum* in that it allows for French recitative’s greater distance from declamation to in fact be truer to the latter, forming what Rochemont refers to as “[une] douce illusion qui place le Spectateur à côté du Personnage.”⁹¹ Ozy further illustrates the point with his detailed justification of French recitative:

s’il est vrai que le récitatif doit être bien moins chanté que les airs, il ne l’est pas moins, qu’il ne doit pas faire perdre toute idée du chant; la raison en est, que nous imaginons les Acteurs de l’Opéra, comme un peuple qui

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*

⁸⁹ This defense of French opera’s effectiveness does however take a different approach from Castel’s *Lettres d’un Académicien de Bordeaux* cited earlier. Cazotte’s view is much more in line with the standard tactics of the *coin du roi*.

⁹⁰ See Kintzler, *Théâtre et opéra à l’âge classique: une famille étrangeté*.

⁹¹ Rochemont, *Réflexions d’un patriote sur l’opéra français et sur l’opéra italien*, in *QB*, 2165.

ne peut que chanter, il faut donc qu'il mette du chant partout, sans cela l'illusion cesserait, et nous verrions tarir une des plus grande sources de nos plaisirs.⁹²

Unreal in everyday life, sung speech the way it is done in French opera—as opposed to Italian recitative, which tries to approximate spoken speech—is the most authentic solution for recitative, and one that actually reinforces the bond of eloquence and music.⁹³

Nevertheless, *pathos* is important of its own right for the *coin du roi*, which acknowledges that the connection to the soul must be direct to be effective.⁹⁴ This is why it is a challenge for eloquence and can perhaps be modeled after music. Although Cazotte's declaration that he is not trying to convince Rousseau is a rhetorical technique that positions those who are in agreement with the author⁹⁵ as the intended recipients and respondents, it also reveals the

⁹² Ozy, *Lettre sur celle de M. J.J. Rousseau*, in *QB*, 876.

⁹³ Once again, for thinkers like Ozy, the *coin de la reine* is excessive in its almost-complete removal of music from its recitative. However, in reality, the two sides agree that recitative must not be just another form of spoken speech, as noted earlier, p. 145. D'Alembert also indicates as much in *De la Liberté de la musique*, in *QB*, 2243: "Mais cette déclamation trancherait trop avec le chant qui suivrait, et l'Opéra ne ferait alors qu'un tout bizarre et monstrueux." The idea that regular speech interspersed with music is as horrific as a hybrid form of French and Italian opera is not just an indication of music's special status that deserves and requires its own specific forms; it is also a clear mockery of the very French form that is *opéra comique*. The comment goes unnoticed during the quarrel in part because D'Alembert's text is published well after it ends—despite being written in the thick of the debate—but also because this genre is not one of the ones being discussed. It is referenced only occasionally, as in Jourdan's comment quoted earlier, p. 152, or in Grimm's passing characterization of the genre as silly and not real opera, in *Le Petit Prophète de Boehmischbroda*, in *QB*, 190. Even D'Alembert only mentions it in a veiled allusion and quickly moves on to other topics. Most likely, this is because *opéra comique*—seen as more of an anomaly than anything else—is not representative of French values in the way its tragic cousin is, while *opera buffa* is however able to incarnate what the French perceive to be a manifestation of Italian ideals.

⁹⁴ Even for Rulhière, there is a sense of music's power in its direct connection to the soul, as evidenced by his description of "un monologue où la Musique a osé développer à nos oreilles ce que l'esprit même a peine à concevoir des infirmités de la vieillesse," *Jugement de l'orchestre de l'opéra*, in *QB*, 447. The ears are the direct conduit to something deeper in this instance. The sense of amazement in such passages from both *coins* indicates an implicit acknowledgment that *pathos* is innate to music in a way that it may not be to rhetoric, and that the latter can therefore learn from the former how to achieve such immediacy. This idea is further developed in the comparison of music and painting analyzed below, p. 157.

⁹⁵ That is, "[les] gens qui ont été remués par le Ballet de Pigmalion et attendris par les beaux endroits de M. Lully," Cazotte, *Observations sur la Lettre de J.J. Rousseau*, in *QB*, 846.

participants' realization that *pathos* is the trickiest of the technical proofs with the interjection "Je sais que le sentiment ne se démontre pas."⁹⁶ This acknowledgment is not merely intended to rebut Rousseau's claims of demonstration; it also speaks to the immediate and invisible connection of music and the soul, which is the type of persuasion to which eloquence aspires. For the partisans of French music, this invisible link is established through a measured form of *pathos* that abides by the rules of *decorum*, and is made possible in great part thanks to harmony. Thus, thinkers such as Aubert—a literary critic and journalist whose father was a composer and member of the académie royale de musique—defend the importance of *choeurs*, even pointing to their influence on recitative: while the latter tells the story, the former provide the needed effect on the listener's state of mind.⁹⁷ The parallel between harmony and melody and eloquence is unmistakable: while a guiding idea is needed, everything else that constitutes eloquence is just as crucial—if not more so, for the French side—and is embodied by harmony in music. Through this reformulation of the theory of affects, harmony—in this type of measured presentation that is more emblematic of the *coin du roi*'s overall ideals than Rameau's bolder personal approach—is given a prominent role in achieving persuasion through its embodiment of a whole structure of component parts, which ties in with the French concept of equally valuing all supporting elements, rather than over-emphasizing one feature (be it melody or *pathos*) at the expense of the others.

So, within this view of harmonic structure, music and eloquence are necessarily linked to one another for the partisans of French music. There is a sense that the many elements prized by

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 847.

⁹⁷ Aubert, *Réfutation suivie et détaillée des principes de M. Rousseau de Genève, touchant la musique française*, in *QB*, 1987.

the French side, and that the *coin de la reine* sees as extraneous, make good use of *decorum* because a system founded on harmony—wherein multiple sounds or ideas reinforce the main thought—encourages the cultivation of such aspects, whether related to composition, performance or structure. Thus, while the *coin de la reine*’s theorists never waiver in their belief that music is necessarily linked to eloquence through language, the *coin du roi* believes that music’s eloquence can come from within its own structure. Bonneval is one of the thinkers who considers the possibility, concluding that the French language’s supposed deficiencies do not impact music because the latter can be “une Musique Eloquente”⁹⁸ in and of itself. Although such terminology can be found in other quarrel texts, Bonneval’s reference is the culmination of one of the most serious reflections on the relationship of eloquence and music: he opposes French music specifically to Rousseau’s linguistic model and considers it in and of itself in a very rare in-depth contemplation of “pure” music—or at least of music as its own, self-sufficient entity within the operatic form. In so doing, Bonneval concludes that good music has the same goals as eloquence: it must “intéresser le cœur et quelque fois l’esprit en charmant les oreilles,”⁹⁹ a condensed summary of the French view of eloquence if there ever was one. The thinker not only values an equal contribution of all parts, he also indicates with the use of the phrase “**intéresser** le coeur” that *movere* is not achieved through overwhelming *pathos* but by means of an intellectual stimulation that very much reflects the French approach to both music and eloquence. For him, it is the bond of the two—this very “Musique Eloquente”—that allows for a distancing from Rousseau by prompting a different perspective of the relationship: because French music born out of harmony naturally values a wider range of rhetorical features than does

⁹⁸ Bonneval, *Apologie de la musique française*, in *QB*, 1067.

⁹⁹ *Ibid*, 1066.

Italian music, it is both innately more rhetorical than its Italian counterpart and less perceivably so than the latter. Without the bridge of language used by both eloquence and music in the *coin de la reine*, the two disciplines are interdependent but manage to maintain a certain level of independence—a perception clearly reflected in French music’s reliance on harmonic structures, and in its refusal to overwhelm the listener. This, for the *coin du roi*, is how music is eloquent, and how eloquence can become musical in a positive sense.

As seen in the section on the *coin de la reine*’s use of *pathos*, the final ways in which the *coins* differ come to light in music’s connection to other arts, and to painting in particular. For most theorists of the *coin du roi*, music’s comparison with painting does not lead to major shifts in the perception of its relationship with eloquence. Either painting is depicted as analogous to music (often through the use of similes or metaphors)¹⁰⁰ without much elaboration beyond the traditional idea that music’s role lies in its depiction of affects,¹⁰¹ or its relation to music is presented as technical—the two arts sharing common tools that allow them to achieve their

¹⁰⁰ On the one hand, similes do not elucidate music’s significance to a very great extent. Thus, Rousselet notes that “J’aimerais autant que le Gènevois, après avoir vû les beaux Tableaux exposés au dernier Salon, eût magistralement prononcé que ce n’était point là de la Peinture,” *Lettres sur la musique française*, in *QB*, 777, which does little beyond establishing a correspondence between the two arts. If anything, music finds itself on equal footing with painting, the latter helping to make more relatable the absurdity of Rousseau’s claims concerning French opera. Metaphors, on the other hand, often illustrate music’s particularly deep effect. For instance, Rameau refers to “ces peintures vives dont l’Harmonie est seule capable.” According to him, music’s power comes from nature (as embodied by harmony) and lies in “grands effets,” which is to say its ability to achieve the aim of *movere*. See Rameau, *Observations sur notre instinct pour la Musique*, in *QB*, 1735-1736.

¹⁰¹ As seen earlier, this idea also exists for the *coin de la reine*. However, for the partisans of French music, painting is used as a point of emphasis, rather than as something that allows music to separate itself from the notion. Rulhière’s analysis of Mondonville’s *Titon et l’aurore* shows how the *coin du roi* initially accepts a traditional view of the relationship between music and eloquence, in which musical composition uses rhetorical techniques to mirror nature and produce certain affects. Each section of the piece is described as evoking specific grand emotions caused by figures like “le Ciel” and “l’Amour,” exactly as would a majestic painting. The author fittingly uses the word “grandeur” to describe ideal painting, which is to say ideal music. See *Jugement de l’orchestre de l’opéra*, in *QB*, 446.

desired productions.¹⁰² This is how Rulhière uses painting to illustrate music's role. For him, the relation of music to painting is negative in its embodiment by the "Géomètres" of the opposing side: "Ils sont en Musique ce qu'est en Peinture un homme qui sait que le vert est composé du bleu et du jaune." Italian musicians therefore know the tools of their craft but do not use them effectively. For French music, however, the emphasis on technique becomes positive: "les accords sont pour un Compositeur ce que les couleurs sont pour un Peintre." French composers, like talented painters, mix and match the tools in their arsenal to bring their compositions to life. Aside from this emphasis on technique, in most cases painting is no different than music for the *coin du roi*:

il [le Peintre] voit l'ensemble du tableau, il en a conçu l'idée ... c'est alors qu'il commence à employer ses couleurs; mais ce fécond travail n'est pas ce qui doit frapper les regards; il faut que du premier coup d'œil on voie tout l'ensemble du tableau, toutes les grandes idées que le peintre a conçues.¹⁰³

For Rulhière, this depiction of the painter is also that of the composer. The two are portrayed as virtually identical and links to eloquence can be made in their affective qualities and the immediacy of their impact, but the comparison of music to painting is not really a component of the genuine relationship between eloquence and music in the way that it exists in other instances for the *coin du roi*. Partisans of French music tend to see the specificities of music's relationship with eloquence separately from painting, and do not contemplate the differences between music

¹⁰² For instance, Jourdan makes the rather banal comparison of poetry as the inspiration of music to models as the inspiration of painting, *Seconde Lettre du correcteur des bouffons*, 572. Similarly, Laugier notes a correspondence in music and painting's goals, as well as the tools used to achieve them, with harmony, measure and song corresponding to line and color, *Apologie de la musique française contre M. Rousseau*, 1152.

¹⁰³ Rulhière, *Jugement de l'orchestre de l'opéra*, in *QB*, 441.

and painting in their construction of this relationship. Painting does, however, allow them to illustrate the lack of *decorum* so rampant in the other *coin*. For instance, Laugier compares the Italian mixing of a joyful measure with a sorrowful melody (a clear interpretation of and attack on Rousseau's principle of variation) to the way in which Rubens went against nature by using bright colors for tragic subjects. So, for many of the *coin du roi*'s thinkers, music is relegated to the status of an art among others, except in its special ability to embody the principles of eloquence—and in the indication that it may in fact have an impact on the latter. The relationship between eloquence and music is therefore primordial in justifying the *querelle*'s topic and the *coin du roi*'s contributions, for it seems to be a preeminent motive for engaging in the profound level of analysis found in this debate.¹⁰⁴

Rameau's contributions to the quarrel are—unsurprisingly—notable exceptions to the equal comparison between music and painting.¹⁰⁵ Indeed, he states that

Pour qu'un rapport de Sons puisse attirer l'attention, la première fois qu'on en est frappé, il faut du moins qu'il soit agréable, sinon il en est de celui-là, comme de tout autre, dans le discours, où l'on n'y est sensible qu'autant qu'il donne plus de force et plus d'énergie à ce qu'on veut peindre...¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁴ The special status of music can also be seen in the actual inclusion of sheet music in their pamphlets by several *coin du roi* thinkers, such as Patu and Portelance, and Chevrier. Clearly, music does hold a special position, even if its status appears somewhat diminished through its comparison to painting.

¹⁰⁵ As indicated earlier (see footnote 66), Rameau is one of the only thinkers who focuses narrowly on music during the quarrel, and his well-known theories place music in a predominant position. However, as examined in Chapter 4, the composer's argumentation is sometimes remarkably similar to that of Rousseau's, which may also help explain his unusual position within the *coin du roi*. In his *Lettre sur la musique à M. le Comte de Caylus*, in Laborde, *Essai sur la musique ancienne et moderne*, v. 3, 553, Arnaud goes so far as to depict Rameau as an Ancient unbeknownst to himself.

¹⁰⁶ Rameau, *Observations sur notre instinct pour la musique*, in *QB*, 1771.

Delectare's position as a primary goal for music reinforces music's close relationship with eloquence, especially since it is presented as its bare minimum, which implies it can (or, for Rameau, should) achieve more. The coining of musical phrases as a "discours" is also telling: music's aim of *movere* is clearly central in the Ciceronian concept that ideas must be painted, and the principle of *docere* is implicitly present in Rameau's earlier and recurrent insistence on necessary frequent exposure to music as a way of understanding it. This is reinforced by the idea that the pleasure felt is "un sentiment involontaire, que le hazard produit, et qui ne peut être dû qu'à ce hazard la première fois qu'on l'éprouve."¹⁰⁷ After this first exposure, repeated experiences allow an instinct—or what others on both sides of the debate call *bon goût*—to form and flourish. This idea of natural *judicium* born out of exposure is achieved through a combination of rhetoric's goals that is also used by Rousseau as examined earlier but formulated through linguistically-based roots and resulting in very different consequences.¹⁰⁸

Even for the most extreme members of the *coin du roi*, then, there is a strong link of music and eloquence through a number of rhetorical principles that lead to a form of *bon goût* based in good part on *decorum*. The sense of pride found in this version of the two disciplines' bond undoubtedly reflects a form of patriotism that values measure and reason, while the Italians are seen as forsaking what really matters in order to provide what amounts to a cheap thrill. Thus, Caux de Cappeval writes "Voilà l'Italien, que l'excès deshonore: Il manque l'à-propos, ou

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁸ For Rameau, music is increasingly in charge of the relationship between eloquence and music. It reflects eloquence's principles but, while melody for Rousseau is fully aligned with the principles of eloquent discourse, harmony for Rameau is a self-contained, all-encompassing principle that eventually replaces *ingenium*. Indeed, it is harmony—not the text or even the author—that dictates the sentiments being expressed and our emotional responses: "C'est principalement du fonds d'Harmonie, dont se tire la Mélodie appliquée aux paroles, que le Chanteur reçoit l'impression du sentiment qu'il doit peindre: ces paroles ne lui servent, pour ainsi dire, que d'indication..." *Ibid.*, 1862.

plutôt il l'ignore.”¹⁰⁹ In addition to the recurring critique of Italian excessiveness, the perception of a lack of honor is powerful, and Italian opera being at fault—and not just the result of some sort of coincidence or unavoidable natural phenomenon—is made clear through the emphasis on its intentionality (“ou plutôt il l'ignore”). For the *coin du roi*, the partisans of Italian music are not merely the victims of their chosen music (though this is part of the problem, as seen earlier); their leaders are aware of the proper ways but choose to go against them. By using the word “propos,” Caux de Cappeval also indicates the other side is simply off base, discussing and composing outside the proper field, and thus producing completely invalid arguments. For the *coin du roi*, there is a deep disconnect between the two sides because the *coin de la reine* simply refuses to acknowledge the essence of French *decorum* through moderation in both music and eloquence, which is to say one of the most important components of what it means to be French.

*
**

The relationship between eloquence and music is particularly interesting because the two domains are perceived in both *coins* as linked: on one side, the two are seen as enjoying shared roots that must be strengthened once again through a common primordial focus on *movere*, while on the other, eloquence and music are both best served by a moderated approach that values a certain intellectual distancing that provides pleasure. Although eloquence and music find themselves integrally bound together by the debate's framers on both sides, there is nevertheless a transfer that must be operated from one domain to the other, and this operation may well be

¹⁰⁹ Caux de Cappeval, *Apologie du goût français*, 1578.

part of what permits the debate's broad implications. Clues as to how this transfer takes place can be found in the musical metaphors employed to write about eloquence and in the application of rhetorical terms to descriptions of music. However, limiting one's self to an examination of these can be dangerous, and Blake Wilson warns in his article on rhetoric and music that musicology's use of literary vocabulary is not indicative of a literary influence on music.¹¹⁰ The present chapter has endeavored to take this advice into account by going beyond questions of vocabulary to examine how music and eloquence play off of and inform each other. In so doing, we have established that an evolving relationship between the two exists in the *querelle des bouffons* and that its conceptualization has different sources and impacts for each *coin*, which lead to a communal valuation of both arts but also result in two very different approaches to the relationship.

To begin, the quarrel's framers demonstrate that if the technical aspects of eloquence and music are subjected to certain more essential qualities, they are nonetheless invaluable: only the appropriate use of each discipline's essential building blocks yields positive results. This use of proper techniques guided by fundamental principles leads to considerations of production and reception informed by the relationship between eloquence and music. While the partisans of French music sometimes ascribe the success of Italian music to the audience's fickle tastes, the other side places the blame squarely with French composers (who fail to adapt to the evolving standards), producing different conceptions—one based on specificity and the other on universality—of music's best use of eloquence as a model. In the two *coins*, there is a general agreement that both producers and receptors participate in music and eloquence's shared goal of

¹¹⁰ Rather, this use of literary terminology is a reflection of such tropes' universality. See Wilson, "Rhetoric and Music," 260-275.

education, and the transfer studied in Chapter 1 can therefore take place, allowing *memoria*'s traditional position on the side of the orator to be integrated into musical works themselves and subsequently passed on to the spectator as one of the elements that gauges a piece's success.

This then leads the two *coins* to form different perceptions of the central and intrinsic relationship between eloquence and music. Both of these go beyond music's agreed-upon primary function of *delectare*, although to varying degrees and using competing approaches, as illustrated through the two different styles of recitative. For the *coin de la reine*, the disciplines' complete reciprocity is operated through the loose application of rhetoric's technical proofs to music, with a particular emphasis on *pathos* born from Ciceronian violence. In this light, *movere* assumes a central position, and music's ability to have a remarkably forceful—and direct—impact that moves to action becomes a role model for eloquence. This not only cements the debate as adhering to rhetorical principles but also incites the reader to view the relationship of music and eloquence as indissoluble. The strategy appears to have worked because, in the quarrel's second phase, the *coin du roi* no longer refutes the existence of this bond; rather, it posits eloquence and music as linked via a different mechanism. For the partisans of French music, the relationship of eloquence and music is built around the crucial notion of *decorum* through moderation, steeped in a modified version of French classicism that relies on sentiment—informed by a long cultural education—as *judicium*, allowing *bon goût* to triumph in an appreciation based on reason and measure, as well as an equal representation of eloquence's components. This prevents the excesses associated with its opponents' too-great reliance on *pathos*, which leads to an inappropriate aggressiveness in both their music and their discourse.

Finally, these approaches allow the question of music's singular position and the reason for its choice as the quarrel's *substantifique moelle* to be elucidated. This is achieved in part through a comparison with painting that helps identify the differences between each *coin*'s perception of its status, while reaching some common conclusions. The partisans of Italian music see a differentiation between painting and music that allows the latter to achieve immediate and violent emotion—also bringing to light a difference in processes, by which music achieves painting's ability to create images but adds to it live and interactive aspects that give it greater force—, thus reaching the highest possible level of impact and greatest likelihood of persuasion,¹¹¹ matched only by Ciceronian rhetoric. This cements the relationship of eloquence and music through a form of *movere* that works both ways: music no longer merely patterns itself after rhetoric but, instead, the two disciplines impact and learn from each other in a circular motion.¹¹² Conversely, the *coin du roi* uses its notion of French *decorum* as a justification for a more measured form of expression that values *pathos*¹¹³ but gives *ethos* and *logos* equal (if not at

¹¹¹ Diderot referred to music as “le plus violent des beaux-arts, sans en excepter ni la poésie, ni l'éloquence” in his 1749 *Lettre sur les aveugles à l'usage de ceux qui voient*, in *Œuvres*, v. 1, 335. Even as specifically compared to eloquence, music's power is awesome and clearly has something to teach.

¹¹² Although the *coin de la reine*'s insistence on music's force is centered on *pathos*, it does not cease to value the parts of rhetoric outlined in Chapter 1. Among these, clarity and variation allow music to show how the goal of education can be achieved, while always contributing to the central aim of *movere*. Thus, Diderot notes of his “petit prophète” (borrowed from Grimm) that clear differences between airs and recitatives—a variant of Rousseau's ideal of simplicity—allow him to achieve a level of understanding that will lead to his ultimately being moved: “il s'aperçut encore qu'il n'en était pas cette fois comme la première; que le récitatif était autre chose que les airs; il distingua très bien l'un et l'autre, parce que le musicien les avait distingués, et il en fut tout surpris,” *Les Trois Chapitres*, in *QB*, 499. Diderot admittedly includes more of an intellectual element than Rousseau openly does—as is the case throughout Diderot's contributions to the *querelle*—but he also insists throughout the passage on the fact that emotions are appropriately and effectively conveyed to the protagonist through music. This seems to indicate that if educating one's reader or listener is a primary goal, music's ability to deeply move shows us how best to achieve this.

¹¹³ For instance, Cazotte indicates in *Observations sur la Lettre de J.J. Rousseau*, in *QB*, 859, concerning music that it is “[le] sentiment qui en est le juge.” Therefore, *pathos* is achieved through a form of *judicium*: while pleasure is what is being measured, there is a sense that the listener has an active role in judging music and, therefore, that he must be persuaded with *decorum* (because the alternate form of forceful persuasion leaves no room for *judicium*).

times superior) consideration in developing the effect sought by music. This yields less of a fusion and more of a unification based on an even valuation of parts, but a new level of parity nevertheless begins to be seen between eloquence and music.

So, the two *coins* are duly sensible to music's special abilities, and the sense of amazement that can be felt on both sides of the divide points to an implicit desire for eloquence to refine its central persuasive element by learning from music—albeit conceived in two different modes. For both *coins*, eloquence's application to music helps the latter to achieve its goals and to be better understood,¹¹⁴ while music's direct connection to the soul through *pathos* and its resulting ability to persuade on an instinctual level—which is widely recognized on either side, whether or not it is endorsed by the participants—is a lesson for eloquence. For Kintzler, this is a continuation of the Aristotelian idea of an aesthetic object engendering philosophy,¹¹⁵ but I believe the process may well be reversed in the case of music during the *querelle des bouffons*: rather than engendering a relation to eloquence, music is conceived by the quarrelers (regardless of whether the composers think in these terms) as setting out to achieve specific goals (those of eloquence) and then observed and judged based on whether it has succeeded. This explains the differences in the two approaches to the relationship between eloquence and music: for the *coin de la reine*, immediacy is key and there is thus an emphasis on *pathos* and *movere*, while the *coin du roi*'s construction of a form of French *decorum* through moderation serves its notion of an intellectual pleasure that thrives on a certain distance and a form of complex

¹¹⁴ The “art d’écouter” called for by both sides and examined in the next chapter is based on the relationship of eloquence and music, with the former serving as a guide to the latter. In fact, Arnaud outlines an unrealized project to write a much-needed “rhétorique de la Musique” in his *Lettre sur la musique à M. le Comte de Caylus*, in Laborde, *Essai sur la musique ancienne et moderne*, v. 3, 552.

¹¹⁵ Kintzler, *Poétique de l’opéra français: de Corneille à Rousseau*, 26-35.

referential pleasure that the Italian side reserves for the secondary works. In both cases, the relationship between eloquence and music is crucial to understanding the debate's content and its overarching structure. The strength of the relationship in the two *coins* further allows the theorists to reinforce rhetoric's fundamental position within intellectual exploration, while attesting to music's ability to go beyond simply providing pleasure.

**Rousseau the Quarreler-in-Chief:
Defining Authorship through a Linguistic Conception of Music**

I. Restoring the author through music.....	172
Respect of authorship: questions of <i>ingenium</i> and originality	174
Designing a defensive harmony	196
II. The French and Italian connections: building a linguistic bridge between eloquence and music	211
No eloquence or music without words.....	213
The intersection of eloquence and music through language, or the recitative	232

In building a closely-knit relationship between eloquence and music, the quarrelers repeatedly indicate they intend to explore issues beyond those presented on the surface. This idea of talking about what is not visible at first glance is enhanced by the musical topic and partially born out of a reflection on the role of imitation in music. Both *coins* agree that music is good for more than just its imitative capacity, even if the latter is one of its fundamental aspects. Like eloquence, for many participants music demands deep reflection and its analysis can hide or reveal undercurrents that allow an expanded debate, as well as the formation of theories—whether explicitly or implicitly. One reason for this is that *ethos* is of prime importance for a

conception of music and eloquence modeled after and impacting each other. Thus, the *coin du roi* repeatedly describes Italian music as a fad that makes use of false arguments and is therefore falsely appealing. To this end, Jourdan maintains that “le faux goût, à l’aide de la mode, peut aveugler pour un temps, la Nation la plus polie, la plus spirituelle, et peut-être la plus aimable de l’Europe, même de l’aveu des autres; c’est une fausse lumière qui l’égare...”¹ In this example, music allows for a frontal attack on both the validity of the *coin de la reine*’s arguments and the most fundamental aspects of its reasoning with the wordplay on “lumière,” which is unmistakably indicative of the other side’s darkness. What becomes clear is that music is viewed and used as an opportunity to concurrently put forward and attack theory. Its examination also brings about questions of responsibility concerning musical and, more generally, intellectual production.

Rousseau leads the way in this analysis, centering his examination on the sources and motivations of production, as well as questions relating to what or who should play the guiding role. In developing this subtext, the second part of this chapter will focus on the way in which he can be seen as advancing the notion of eloquent music and musical eloquence linked through language. A close examination of Rousseau’s theory of language, with a particular focus on the *Lettre sur la musique française*—which both defines the *querelle des bouffons* (the text that really transforms the debate into a quarrel, as we have noted) and serves as the precursor to the philosopher’s own *Essai sur l’origine des langues*—will allow for a better understanding of Rousseau’s (mostly successful) attempts to guide the debate, as well as an appreciation of this linguistic conduit. He begins by advocating the need for a clear and definitive author’s

¹ Jourdan, *Le Correcteur des bouffons à l’écolier de Prague*, in *QB*, 196.

perspective in the quarrelers' intellectual output. Born from the previously-examined notion of firmly choosing a *coin*, it is the pamphleteer's responsibility to clearly assert his position within the quarrel—and, much as melody guides good music, the author must make clear and strong arguments in relation to whatever wider topics he is broaching. So, the importance of following the rules of eloquence is very much in line with the central thesis of Christopher Kelly's *Rousseau as Author: Consecrating One's Life to the Truth* that Rousseau's conception of authorship revolves around the notion of public responsibility, the position of *ethos* within public debates like this one being particularly crucial. In a sense, Kelly's work supports the importance of our rhetorical frame in its positioning of the public act of publishing as central in Rousseau's belief in benefiting the public through *docere* and simultaneous self-promotion as an author—an act that is really more in line with the need to stake out a strong position and assume the associated responsibilities than a signal of self-aggrandizement.

Forming the nucleus of the first part of the chapter and just as integral to Rousseau's concept of strong authorship—as well as equally linked to the notion of authorial output inscribed within a public function—is the role of the reader or listener: a close reading of the pamphlets reveals that on the receiving end, this authorship must not only be respected but sought out in one's reading of—and responses to—the *querelle's* texts. *Judicium* (which, in a circular motion, can be fostered in their readers by good authors) is key in this endeavor, since one must be able to recognize what Rousseau will term in his *Confessions* “un auteur qu'il faut lire avec application.”² Another important axis for Rousseau can be found in the linguistic roots of intellectual endeavors, which we will see are presented for the purposes of this debate as the

² Rousseau, *Les Confessions*, in *Œuvres*, 122.

missing link that allows for the interdependence of eloquence and music examined in in the last chapter, the bridge that allows creators and active receivers alike to travel between the two disciplines. While this second branch of Rousseau's quarrel writings is easily reconciled with the philosopher's broader theories—the simple, ancient-like quality of Italian being starkly opposed to the highly-evolved, refined position of French as a symbol of all that Rousseau rejects in the Enlightenment—,³ the first one is less obviously in alignment. At first glance, the call for strong authorship, both in its guiding role and in the respect paid to it by the reader and fellow contributors alike—what Kelly sees as Rousseau's desire to learn and which can be translated in the context of the quarrel as respectful rather than gratuitous criticism, in the case of enemies, or building on previous works that truly takes into account the original author's point of view, in the case of allies—, appears to have something in common with the political system in place. However, a closer examination reveals the exact opposite. In fact, this chapter will try to show that it foreshadows Rousseau's writings to come,⁴ and his forthcoming break with the *philosophes*: Rousseau's requirements do everything to provide the judging public with what it needs to make an informed decision, whereby its choice will not only be a good one—rather than a blind one—but will also result in the public's quasi-republican reclaiming of authority (not dissimilar from the one embodied by the author).

I. Restoring the author through music

If the *querelle*'s conception by men of letters certainly influences the localization of the bond between eloquence and music in language, it plays an equally important role in how

³ Wolker shows this criticism of the Enlightenment and, more broadly, of civil society in the *Lettre sur la musique française* to be one of the reasons Rousseau comes to be seen as the “enemy of progress,” *Rousseau*, 55.

⁴ See, for example, the citation from *La Nouvelle Héloïse* on p. 164.

musicological topics are theorized. Indeed, music seems poised to reinvigorate both the written word and the linguistically-based discipline of rhetoric itself. Kintzler demonstrates convincingly that Rousseau attacks not only Rameau but also French classical thought. She argues that he avoids the personal in order to construct a philosophy, both in his *Lettre sur la musique française* and (the text's contentious title notwithstanding) his *Examen de deux principes de M. Rameau*. I concur as far as the underlying premise is concerned: Rousseau is clearly seeking to establish and defend big ideas. However, I also contend that it is the relationship between eloquence and music that allows him to accomplish this in the *querelle des bouffons*. While Rameau positions music as a knowledge-generating science, Rousseau instead views it as the quarrel's predominant *exemplum*, which can be used not only to illustrate but to refine the principles of eloquence and in particular the shared goal of *movere*. (This demonstrative quality and the intellectual pleasure displayed by Rousseau are not unrelated to Rameau's approach but Rousseau's vision is more restrained and in line with that of such measured thinkers as D'Alembert who view Rameau as having gone too far.) As such, I maintain that Rousseau actually seeks out opportunities to attack his opponents (and Rameau above all)—not out of vindictiveness as has sometimes been argued, but precisely because the personal is being redefined as valuable both in and of itself (as opposed to its diminished position within classical grandeur) and in the service of larger ideals, through a conscious effort to contribute to eloquence's evolving form. This begins with reflections on the importance of rhetorical principles for written production and for the status of the author. The quarrel's thinkers, led by Rousseau and staying true to their central topic, gradually link these considerations to perceptions of music.

Respect of authorship: questions of *ingenium* and originality

Whether or not Grimm's *Lettre sur Omphale* is accepted as the quarrel's first text, the author's influence on the quarrel and on Rousseau is clear and can be felt in the central position afforded to authorship by the latter. Later, in his *Confessions*, Rousseau will in fact frequently describe authorship as a point of pride, such as in his note that La Noue was "homme de mérite et auteur,"⁵ the two clearly being interrelated. Although Rousseau's citing Grimm is in part due to his colleague being on the same side (despite any pretense to the contrary), it is not difficult to find other facets from which Rousseau is able to draw inspiration. Not the least of these is Grimm's stated approach, which points out the paradox by which the French claim the right to judge foreign music but refuse to allow their music to be assessed by others, on the grounds that one must be culturally French to appreciate it:

Je n'ignore pas que toutes les fois qu'il est question de leur Musique, les Français refusent nettement la compétence à tous les autres peuples, et ils ont leurs raisons pour cela. Cependant, quand ces mêmes Français nous assurent que la Musique Chinoise est détestable, je ne crois pas qu'ils se soient donnés la peine de prendre l'avis des Chinois pour prononcer ce jugement. Pourquoi nous ôteraient-ils par rapport à eux au moins sur la Musique un droit dont ils usent très librement, et sur plus d'un point, à l'égard des autres nations?⁶

Just as Rousseau will do, Grimm is emphasizing the need for impartiality and, more important, for not interpreting out of context. In this instance, the context is cultural but it is easily extended

⁵ Rousseau, *Les Confessions*, in *Œuvres*, 202. As if by coincidence, La Noue (an actor and playwright) is one of the first to appreciate Rousseau's *Narcisse*, helping it reach the stage of the Comédie Française. It should also be noted that Rousseau sometimes express distaste for authors and "gens de lettres" in his *Confessions*, but this is precisely because they fail to treat the role of authorship as it should be.

⁶ Grimm, *Lettre sur Omphale*, in *QB*, 5.

by Rousseau to fit his musings on authorship. The simplicity of Grimm's argument and its apparent honesty are seductive and difficult to contradict. However, Grimm's seemingly innocent approach dissimulates a reliance on certain principles of eloquence that foreshadows the idea of authorial intent and uses the French approach to justify the *coin de la reine*'s authority. While Grimm implicitly reiterates the fact that Europe (the most relevant subset of "tous les autres peuples") has already adopted Italian music and reaches out as far as China—as will Rousseau after him—to demonstrate France's insularity and the dishonesty (as well as the absurdity) of its approach, his critique is also an evaluation of the idea of proper expertise using the rhetorical precepts most valued by the French side: *decorum*, *logos* and *ethos*. Thus, Grimm's disavowal of the notion is also an indication that the right to judge music in the fashion proposed—if, indeed, such a right were to exist—must repair the absurdity of this approach (restoring *logos* by determining what allows this judgment, which is to say a demonstrable expertise), as well as apply it ethically (using exactly the same criteria for one's own music as that of others) and with *decorum* (forbidding blanket statements that amount to unfounded, inappropriate insults). This dissimulated facet of Grimm's statement offers the Italian camp a decided advantage, were the French approach to be embraced: the supporters of Italian music (and its hidden aspects) are the only true experts concerning its intent and proper interpretation; yet, the Frenchmen within this camp (and those, like Rousseau, who are not French but claim overall allegiance to France) also have a legitimate right to interpret aspects of their home country's music and cannot be attacked as lacking a native's understanding. The partisans of French music, on the other hand, remain as unqualified to criticize the music of Italy as that of

China. This both allows Grimm to avoid alienating his reader and essentially renders the notion of cultural specificity irrelevant for those it was intended to benefit.

From the onset, then, Grimm plays a key role in conceptualizing the forthcoming *querelle* as a polemical debate that goes beyond the mere comparison of French and Italian music but retains from it the opposition of France versus “others” at its core. Indeed, in the second paragraph of his *Lettre sur Omphale*, Grimm considers French music as opposed to “European” music, planting the idea in his reader’s mind that France is resisting what has already become an otherwise borderless, continental phenomenon:

Je ne veux point renouveler ici les parallèles usés de la Musique Européenne et de la Musique Française, car comme tous les juges font parties, c’est un procès qui ne finira jamais. J’en parlerai seulement, autant qu’il est nécessaire, pour autoriser la liberté que je prends, d’examiner cette dernière...⁷

By clearly stating that his intent is not to rehash the debate on French and Italian music but rather to go beyond it by thoroughly examining one side of the issue, Grimm implies that past debates have been somewhat superficial (due to what he calls the “fureur des comparaisons”).⁸ This provides license to and motivation for the quarrelers to delve into previously unexplored territory, requiring a form of original thinking born out of these considerations of otherness that values strong authorship. The latter is founded both on a firm point of view that can persuade any reader or listener, and on an ability to interact with previous work in a way that improves upon, rather than merely duplicates, it. This notion of authorship also relies on the public to fully

⁷ *Ibid.*, 4.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 6. This does not appear to be a criticism of a sort of scientific history. Rather, it is closer to an indictment of the rampant one-upmanship of previous debaters, which kept them from delving into underlying issues in a serious manner.

respect and seek out authorial intent (as the authors themselves do in relation to other works, setting the example), thus extending its impact by fully engaging the recipient. The work of the author, if properly done, is therefore carried over to the good reader or listener, who becomes an active part of the construct.

This approach supports a certain simplicity—but not a lack of depth—in its quest for broad appeal. It is therefore the perfect source for Rousseau to find inspiration, as he goes about laying the foundations of the quarrel. Indeed, one of Rousseau's central theories seems highly influenced by Grimm's summing up of Italian music's universal appeal, which is both due to the music's internal strengths and to the listeners' openness of mind through proper listening:

La Musique Italienne promet et donne du plaisir à tout homme qui a des oreilles, il n'y faut pas plus de préparation que cela. Si tous les peuples de l'Europe l'ont adoptée, malgré la différence des langues, c'est qu'ils ont préféré leur plaisir à leurs prétentions.⁹

As will Rousseau, Grimm acknowledges the importance of language in various countries' national music and indicates that the very fact linguistic considerations have been put aside throughout Europe is indicative of Italian music's merits. Also similarly to Rousseau, Grimm's indication that Italian music can be enjoyed by all without preparation is not a sign that Italian music offers only cursory pleasure, nor that it does not benefit from a developed examination. Rather, taking its cue from eloquence, good music must be able to appeal to all while offering careful listeners added rewards. As such, it promises and gives pleasure to “tout homme qui a des oreilles,” which encompasses both the untrained but interested listener (the public, upon whom Grimm focuses here) and the more skilled semi-professional listener (the other pamphleteers). It

⁹ *Ibid.*, 5.

takes a very skilled composer to achieve this—especially in such a way that the result retains a level of simplicity. One can already sense a link to the concept of strong authorship: only the surest, most eloquent music will be able to please and persuade in a manner that reaches across national boundaries and creates a form of interaction with the good listener.¹⁰

There is a concurrent sense throughout the quarrel's exchanges that using previous work as a sort of stepping-stone is not only permitted but required, as long as the original authorial intent is respected and something new added. Rousseau himself encourages proper interpretation of and embellishment on previous works, frequently integrating the latter to such an extent into his own texts that his critics—despite the fact that he is far from being the only one to do this—use such unaccredited citations as an indication of a lack of respect towards their originators. Thus, Morand and Estève go out of their way to properly cite their sources, contrasting this practice with what they see as Rousseau's liberal borrowing from Estève's own *Esprit des beaux-arts*. They recommend “qu'il ne croie pas avoir trouvé cela tout seul”¹¹ and call him a “Copiste”¹² —which in itself is a nod to unity through referencing, as Travenol had used the same term in the title of a pamphlet written a month earlier—who masquerades as “le premier

¹⁰ In *Le Petit Prophète de Bohémischbroda*, in *QB*, 138, Grimm develops the idea and indicates that strong authors make good use of techniques such as repetition (or *leitmotifs* in music) to permit their readers or listeners to achieve both pleasure and the strongest possible sense of *memoria*. The latter is both the motivation for and the result of good authorship and this use of repetition thus almost seems to become the embodiment of a sort of *confirmatio*. (Grimm himself uses the technique abundantly in *Le Petit Prophète*, as in his frequent and repeated characterization of the académie royale de musique as an academy “qui n'en est pas une.” See 171, for example.) In the wrong hands, strong authorship yields disastrous results, as in the case of French music, which Grimm blames in this passage on the poet rather than the composer.

¹¹ Morand and Estève, *Justification de la musique française. Contre la querelle qui lui a été faite par un allemand et un allobroge. Adressée par elle-même au coin de la reine le jour qu'avec Titon et l'Aurore elle s'est remise en possession de son théâtre*, in *QB*, 1118.

¹² *Ibid.* In his *Confessions*, in *Œuvres*, 189 and 209, Rousseau describes his job as a “copiste de musique” as a matter of fiduciary necessity (and, 247, a job at which he was far from excelling) but, here, the term seems to take on a negative connotation, especially in light of the cross-referencing incorporated by Morand and Estève.

Auteur, ou l'Inventeur.”¹³ Clearly, Morand and Estève feel the latter has been plagiarized, rather than built upon (worsening rather than enhancing his theories by making them polemical, as he will indicate further on in his critique).

Regardless of who is correct in this instance, the position of the author is visibly sacrosanct for both *coins*, whether through long citations,¹⁴ referencing or theories that build on past efforts. Interestingly, Rousseau takes a certain pride in his role as an “impunément mauvais copiste”¹⁵ in his 1761 *Seconde Lettre à Malesherbes*. Could this be a reference to the quarrel, and Morand and Estève’s attacks? The possibility is certainly reinforced by Rousseau’s linking of this depiction to his in authorship: he indicates that one must be a respected author in order to get away with being a poor *copiste*, the latter serving as a sort of proof of the former. During the *querelle* proper, Rousseau’s approach to original work based on previous writings that respects authorial intent—rather, perhaps, than the author himself, as demanded by thinkers such as Morand and Estève—can be seen in the previously-cited passage from the *Essai sur l’origine des langues* that describes the need for music to be eloquent and ponders precisely what guides it, thus calling for a true vision rather than a system that lets music dictate its own unfolding.¹⁶ In addition to the passage’s self-referential quality (with the author’s wording very closely mirroring what he wrote in his *Lettre sur la musique française*), Rousseau’s post-quarrel text

¹³ Morand and Estève, *Ibid.*, 1121.

¹⁴ For example, Travenol quotes especially long passages from Rousseau’s *Lettre sur la musique française* in which the *philosophe* purports to “teach” French musicians, *Arrêt du Conseil d’État d’Apollon, rendu, en faveur de l’orchestre de l’opéra, contre le nommé J.-J. Rousseau, copiste de musique, auteur du Devin du Village, et de l’écrit intitulé, Lettre sur la Musique Française, etc. Extrait des registres du Conseil d’État d’Apollon*, in *QB*, 849.

¹⁵ Rousseau, *Lettres à M. de Malesherbes*, in *Œuvres*, 304.

¹⁶ See Chapter 2. As a reminder, here is the passage in question from Rousseau’s *Essai sur l’origine des langues*, 113: “Des suites de sons ou d’accords m’amuseront un moment peut-être; mais pour me charmer et m’attendrir, il faut que ces suites m’offrent quelque chose qui ne soit ni son ni accord, et qui vienne émouvoir malgré moi. Les chants qui ne sont qu’agréables et ne disent rien lassent encore; car ce n’est pas tant l’oreille qui porte le plaisir au cœur, que le cœur qui le porte à l’oreille.”

formulates a sort of expanded synthesis of his *querelle* notion, which focused on the more practical aspects of his theory of “unité de mélodie,”¹⁷ slightly modifying his own argument to fit his current purpose: here, something beyond the melody—the guiding idea behind it, or authorial intent (“Les chants qui ne sont qu’agréables et ne disent rien” being irrelevant)—is revealed to be its true essence. Rousseau notes in closing that “en développant mieux ces idées on se fût épargné bien de sots raisonnements sur la musique ancienne,”¹⁸ adding that “bon goût” and “vertu” go hand in hand. The chapter’s final sentence therefore constitutes an endorsement of the methods used by its author during the *querelle* and, since it forms the closing thought of a chapter on morality, implies that a certain transformation of source ideas is positive, as long as the original intent is respected. This ties into the notion of an appropriate conversation that builds on previous commentary,¹⁹ and suggests that only those texts that play by these rules in a written debate like the *querelle des bouffons* should be considered.

The importance of a firm, developed point of view, combined with a respect for seeking other authors’ intent in reading their works—authorial intent being the component that transfers *ingenium* from the author to its location in the written text within the context of the quarrel, creating a sort of written *ethos* that must be respected—, is an idea that catches on with many of the participants from both *coins*, in the wake of Rousseau’s *Lettre sur la musique française*. For instance, much like Morand and Estève, one of the staunchest partisans of the *coin du roi*, the Père Castel makes use of Rousseau’s technique of self-referencing from the beginning of his

¹⁷ As defined in Chapter 1, “unité de mélodie,” sees a unified melody governing all other musical considerations.

¹⁸ Rousseau, *Essai sur l’origine des langues*, 113.

¹⁹ The idea of evolving works that visibly use previous efforts as their basis is a recurring theme, explaining the frequent use of citations. Along these lines, Anthony Grafton indicates that Samuel-Auguste Tissot writes in 1768 that only authors of absolutely complete works could forgo citations (*The Footnote: A Curious History*, 95).

Lettres d'un académicien de Bordeaux and takes it to another level by making it completely overt: "Le P. C. dans les paradoxes de son Clavecin, a prétendu que le Chat avait son miaulis diapasonné. M. R. n'entend point ce Français-là."²⁰ This is not an attack on Rousseau's failure to explicitly credit authors, so much as it is a reflection on the importance of fully seeking out the authors' views, as he himself has demanded. Accepting the idea that the quarrel contains a subtext, Castel uses the opportunity to reference his own work ("le P. C.") in a way that supposes his reader is familiar with his previous writings and, if not, that he will go back to this source—affirming the public's active role. This serves the dual purpose of a sort of self-promotion and a more general support of authorial intent in the manner put forward by his oponent. In this instance, the somewhat humorous anecdote also serves to contrast with the seriousness of the topic at hand, suggesting that even animals possess a musical instinct superior to Rousseau's. The *philosophe's* qualifications are further attacked, on a more fundamental level that precisely questions the strength of his authorial capacity: calling Rousseau's decisions "arbitraire[s]" in his fifth letter, Castel declares that "Il n'y a que M. R. pour décider l'absolu, sans définir le relatif."²¹ Rousseau makes judgment calls without defining what he is criticizing or praising. He is neither scientific nor methodical, which means that his theoretical constructions are flawed, going straight to the notion of proper guidance in the debate as essential. Similarly, the very title of Marin's *Lettre à Madame Folio* (*Ce qu'on dit, ce qu'on a voulu dire*) calls for a valuing of not only the author but, in its parenthetical indication, of a decoding—through philological means,

²⁰ Castel, *Lettres d'un académicien de Bordeaux sur le fonds de la musique, à l'occasion de la Lettre de M. R*** contre la musique française*, in *QB*, 1373.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 1404.

these being the only accurate method possible—to find true meaning.²² Finally, even Laugier (who provides some of the strongest rejections of Rousseau’s theoretical framing) supports strong authorial intent. He does so by agreeing with Rousseau that *ingenium* does not have a place in *actio*: the former is exercised only by a work’s creator, while the latter should be an attempt to properly convey what was intended by the composer. Thus, musical interpretation requires only “de l’exercice et de l’habitude.”²³ This is a rather unusual admission, given that the other side attacks French music precisely for relying too much on its interpreters but, as an architect and one of the few thinkers who goes on to focus on musical commentary (co-editing *Sentiment d’un harmonophile sur différents ouvrages de musique* in 1756), he has a unique perspective that calls for very strictly following the composer’s indications (which in his mind should be clearer than they are in practice). In this respect and despite his allegiance to French music, his ideas are in line with Rousseau’s concerning musical notation and clarity. Returning to the *coin de la reine*, D’Alembert takes a different approach to Rameau than does Rousseau, as noted previously, but his support of authorship is just as strong. In fact, his quasi-support of Rameau even reinforces the point: by depicting the composer as smart and only producing the best music the France can accept, not the best he could write, he reveals just how important guidance can be.²⁴ France is still to blame but, for D’Alembert, *Platée*—Rameau’s first comic opera, often referenced during the quarrel for this reason and revived in 1754 following its debut ten years earlier, its odd position among the *tragédies lyriques* preferred by the *coin du roi*

²² This is confirmed in the letter’s introduction: “Je vais donc vous exposer d’abord ce qu’on a dit, et ensuite ce qu’on a voulu dire,” Marin, *Ce qu’on a dit, ce qu’on a voulu dire, Lettre à Madame Folio, Marchande de Brochures dans la Place du vieux Louvre*, in *QB*, 473.

²³ Laugier, *Apologie de la musique française contre M. Rousseau*, in *QB*, 1169.

²⁴ This attempt to be fairer, or at least to give an alternative explanation of bad French music, offers the readers a real choice in joining the Italian side. D’Alembert, *De la Liberté de la musique*, in *QB*, 2208.

theoretically making it an interesting counterpart to *opere buffe*—is the epitome of French music and its negative aspects are a result of Rameau’s strong authorial control, rather than his weakened position, as depicted by Rousseau.

Similarly, any responses will be held to high standards and a proper level of impartiality and accuracy expected. In his *Lettre à M. Grimm*, which is a response to the supposed critique of Grimm’s *Lettre sur Omphale* by an anonymous commentator, Rousseau comes down hard on the respondent’s failure in these areas. The author’s extreme lack of logic allows Rousseau to demonstrate deep flaws in his most basic arguments and discrediting any conclusions drawn by someone who so clearly lacks even the most basic intellectual faculties:

Le Compère prétend que parce que le genre bouffon est connu en Italie, il n’est pas vrai que M. Rameau en soit le créateur en France: cela est extrêmement plaisant. Car s’il n’eût point existé de genre bouffon en Italie, il eût été fort ridicule de dire que M. Rameau en avait créé un *en France*.²⁵

Adding that he will not delve into the possible existence of a “genre bouffon” in France (a point on which he clearly disagrees with Grimm), Rousseau manages to ridicule his friend’s adversary, while showing the importance of sound argumentation. This forecasts the key role of textual analysis in the quarrel, and skillfully shifts the focus away from Rousseau’s points of disagreement with Grimm. As a result, throughout the text, the “Commentateur” comes across as lacking not only eloquence but an ability to engage in basic reasoning. In essence, he is not worthy of the title of author, allowing Rousseau to fine tune the notion of respect of authorial intent. He does this by developing Grimm’s indication that *ethos* (or credibility) is key, all the

²⁵ Rousseau, *Lettre à M. Grimm*, in *QB*, 96-97.

while transforming the category into a broader, more inclusive form that no longer requires specialization. The selection is made on a more fundamental level: without the most basic *ethos* demonstrated by at least a simple understanding of *logos*, there can be no authorial intent.

Rousseau is the biggest proponent of the need to further and respect the author's voice in the quarrel's exchanges and he brings to light a number of parallels between eloquence, authorship and musical production that eventually tie into his linguistic theories, examined in the second part of this chapter. This is particularly evident in a number of relatively subtle passages of his *Lettre sur la musique française* that demand careful readings. For instance, Rousseau notes of a recitative that almost completely fuses music and spoken language ("celui qui approche le plus de la parole") that it would surely surpass all others—but the statement is more complex than it initially appears:

... s'il y en avait un qui en approchât tellement, en conservant l'harmonie qui lui convient, que l'oreille ou l'esprit pût s'y tromper, on devrait prononcer hardiment que celui-là aurait atteint toute la perfection dont aucun récitatif puisse être susceptible.²⁶

The passage is both a swift digest of what he has just concluded a few lines earlier and a preview of what he goes on to call a "règle" in the following paragraph. This allows Rousseau to go one step further in his proposal than the standard rhetorical practice of reiteration. By pre-formulating his conclusion in this fashion, the author is able to lead the reader to inevitable agreement if Rousseau manages to make his case. It is also worth noting that the importance of being completely overtaken by the sense of real speech in musical form is so great that it affects "l'oreille ou l'esprit." To fully convince, recitative obviously has to have an impact on both—

²⁶ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 174.

one of the *Lettre*'s *leitmotifs*—but in this instance Rousseau chooses to use the conjunction “ou” rather than “et,” which subtly calls for a reflection on the relationship of the two. For the close reader, this draws attention to something beyond a coupling of the two ideas and plants the idea of a possible effect of one on the other. As such, if this duality is taken to mirror the melody-harmony construct, the ear is in essence being used to fool the mind in a positive way, which is to say to allow ideas to reach it. Indeed, such a parallel links “la parole” (which is for Rousseau what must be listened to closely, as it is carried by the melody) to “l'esprit,” a fresh (if hidden) reminder that affairs of the mind are the domain of the creators—which is to say the thinkers and philosophers—, and always tied to linguistic theories. This continued emphasis on the *philosophes*' role as guides also reminds the reader that he must always listen to the author's voice and, going one step further, seek out its theoretical intent, just as the reflection brought about by the linguistic trick creates a link to all the other instances in which Rousseau shows good music to be the conduit of its author's intellectual reflection—through the ears—to the mind.

This call for close reading and listening is a recurring theme throughout the debate and even Rousseau's fiercest opponents agree on its necessity in achieving *ethos*. Thus, Rameau points out the difference between listening versus merely hearing: “il y a une différence entre entendre et écouter.”²⁷ For the composer, habit and constant exposure to music lead to being able to listen, in accordance with the preeminent position of nature in his system, while for Rousseau education plays a larger role. Rameau expounds on this point by showing that listening (as opposed to hearing) leads to very different choices in music: through nature and exposure, a

²⁷ Rameau, *Observations sur notre instinct pour la musique et sur son principe: où les moyens de reconnaître l'un par l'autre, conduisent à pouvoir se rendre raison avec certitude des différents effets de cet art*, in *QB*, 1751.

close listener might have the option to choose between hearing a fifth or a third. In Rameau's example the latter is selected but his theories posit the fifth as the purer interval, closer to nature, which leads the reader of this passage to wonder whether in this particular instance the third is the better choice or whether perhaps the listener has made a mistake. Whatever the case, Rameau demonstrates in his own fashion the need for both close listening and close reading, directed by his special form of authorial guidance, which ends up being almost the exact inverse of Rousseau's. Indeed, harmony soon replaces nature itself as "ce guide de l'oreille"²⁸ from which all of music's other aspects emanate. Within this view of music, Rameau presents music's *ingenium* as harmony—for it is "l'harmonie d'un premier Corps sonore"²⁹ that is the linchpin for everything that ensues, rising naturally from within music itself (in the hands of a good composer, who knows how to let music speak for itself) and determining a piece's unfolding—and elaborates a version of *judicium* that consists almost purely of listening (an active role in and of itself, as opposed to hearing), which is to say allowing one's self to be guided by harmony. Although Rousseau also sees active listening as part of *judicium*, something completely external dictates the right path for Rameau, and no authorial decision is actually made at the source. Everything emanates from the "corps sonore." This vision of external factors and their consequences is quite different from Rousseau's perception, threatening the very notion of strong authorial intent, and relegating decisions to a mere choice—albeit an informed choice—between preordained possibilities. Although this perspective grants to music a remarkable force not dissimilar to the *coin de la reine*'s use of *pathos*, it also weakens Rameau's own position as a theorist, mirroring almost exactly—after the fact—Rousseau's depiction of the composer in his

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 1752.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

Lettre as lacking any real authority. Rameau will attempt to reclaim some of his power with his notion of “instinct” but the latter (which essentially seems to replace *bon goût*) is still derived from music itself and one can see how this would pose a problem for the *philosophes*, both within the quarrel and in their broader conception of intellectual production.³⁰ For the *coin du roi*, melody—like theory—is guided by the notion of strong authorial intent and serves as conduit for it, transferring both *memoria* and *judicium* from author to reader or listener (using language as the intermediary, for Rousseau), much as the quarrel is transferred from the oral to the written form. For thinkers aligned with Rameau, however, harmony is a self-sufficient concept that is both the conduit and the very source of an idea, relinquishing intellectual production and language to subservient roles.

This question of language’s role returns us to the central topic of the recitative, with which Rousseau finds fault in its French incarnation or, rather, “ce qu’on appelle en France récitatif,” reiterating his for variation. In this instance, it is not so much the latter’s lack, as one might suspect, which Rousseau criticizes as a language “dont l’accent est si uni, si simple, si modeste, si peu chantant” not authentically being represented by the strange spectacle that is French recitative:

... cette extravagante criailerie qui passé à chaque instant de bas en haut
et de haut en bas, parcourt sans sujet toute l’étendue de la voix et suspend

³⁰ Rameau places more responsibility in the receiver’s hands than do the *philosophes*. He does not advocate the authorial intent of the Italian side, in which freedom of expression is the result; rather, he asks composers and interpreters to listen (not just hear, as we saw earlier) and make the right choices. (See *Observations sur notre instinct pour la musique et sur son principe*, in *QB*, 1806.) Rameau’s conception of the relationship between eloquence and music is purely interested in its effects on music and harmony’s position as fundamental. As already noted and unlike other theorists, he is not interested in tying this into a larger debate.

le récit hors de propos pour filer de beaux sons sur des syllabes qui ne signifient rien et qui ne forment aucun repos dans le sens!³¹

Not only is the French style of recitative hard on the ears, it inaccurately represents the French language and is therefore unfaithful to the elemental “règle” Rousseau has just established, according to which music and language must coalesce perfectly. Within this perception, the French language is to blame because it does not give music any inspiration, and French recitative therefore finds itself forced to manipulate language in nonsensical ways, as it had in the case of the musical monologue. To this, Rousseau adds a crucial indication that the “récit” is adversely affected: not only does language lose all meaning but the story itself is interrupted and becomes equally devoid of content. We therefore come to see that, although French music’s problems are linguistic in origin, Rousseau is simultaneously denouncing composers as sharing the responsibility. While a lack of musicality in the French language prevents good music from happening, the composers’ inability to be faithful to their language aggravates the situation, stripping the French recitative of any *logos* or *decorum*. These two features, which have been central to the *coin du roi*’s view of music, are therefore negated for the Italianists by lacks linguistic and authorial—both of which are intentional as far as Rameau is concerned.

Just as recognizing authorship is necessary for Rousseau, the thinker also enjoys discrediting or even removing authorial intent where he sees it as misattributed—most often in the person of Rameau. At least in part, this is because for Rousseau, the degradation of the French language leads to poor melodies, which in turn cause harmony to take on too prominent a role. In the *Lettre sur la musique française*, Rameau loses his status as a savvy theorist and

³¹ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 174.

practitioner of harmonic modulations, becoming instead a victim of the sorry state of French music who, almost through no fault of his own, is confronted with the impossibility of creating good music:

L'impossibilité d'inventer des chants agréables obligerait les compositeurs à tourner tous leurs soins du côté de l'harmonie, et faute de beautés réelles, ils y introduiraient des beautés de convention, qui n'auraient presque d'autre mérite que la difficulté vaincue: au lieu d'une bonne musique, ils imagineraient une musique savante...³²

Within the context of Rousseau's theoretical development of the role of authorship, temporarily absolving Rameau of any guilt also has the calculated effect of confiscating his power as a creator making conscious choices (something the composer himself embraces as we saw, perhaps unintentionally, in his subsequent *Observations sur notre instinct pour la musique*). Instead, a Rameau victimized by the decrepit state of French language and melody is seen as turning to harmony as a way to fill-in his score and distract his audience. This becomes even clearer as the paragraph, aimed directly at Rameau, ends with one of the most virulent attacks imaginable—one that will play a recurrent role in Rousseau's writings: French music is not music but, at best, noise. Thus, Rousseau described French composers—ever so slightly disguised in the opening of the *Lettre* as a mere hypothesis—as forced to use harmony because their language's deficiency forbids any sort of pleasant “chant” (which is to say, melody):

... pour suppléer au chant, il leur en coûterait moins de placer beaucoup de mauvaises parties les unes au-dessus des autres que d'en faire une qui fût

³² *Ibid.*, 145.

bonne. Pour ôter l'insipidité, ils augmenteraient la confusion; ils croiraient faire de la bonne musique, et ils ne feraient que du bruit.³³

This supreme affront is compounded by the fact that French composers are portrayed as lazy. Rousseau seems to indicate that if they really tried, perhaps they could compose good music (despite his earlier and subsequent claims that this is not achievable), but French composers have taken the easy way out by using excessive harmonic artifices. In a circuitous way, this addresses the notion that the “musique savante” of Rameau is in fact anything but an intellectual feat, aligning the statement with Rousseau’s authorial theories: an author must not only provide strong guidance, it is also his responsibility to use *ethos* in writing for the greater good.³⁴ The difficulty of French music for the audience alluded to at the beginning of the passage is therefore not due to the listener’s lack of education (as Rameau would contend, and as might be the case in certain rhetorical readings) but to the composer’s inability to produce simplicity. For Rousseau, difficult music camouflages a shortcut and a lack of authorial vision that causes a reliance on technique, while simple music is actually far more difficult to achieve, sometimes more complex at its core, and often the product of true reflection. For him, this is the music that is truly eloquent, with simplicity allowing the composer to reach—as well as please—any audience that listens with an open mind (via attentive ears).

So, once again, Rousseau has reversed a commonly accepted notion that there is some sort of virtue to the complicated use of technique that reflects hard work, accessible to those with

³³ *Ibid.*

³⁴ See Christopher Kelly, *Rousseau as Author: Consecrating One's Life to the Truth*, in which the book’s subtitle (“consecrating one’s life to the truth,” the motto embraced by Rousseau and owed to Juvenal) is explained as both being responsible to the public for one’s published works and publishing only what benefits this public. Kelly also shows how Rousseau takes great pains to improve his writing skills and cultivates his position as an author with a unified persona throughout his varied works. This works in perfect tandem with Rousseau’s notion of strong authorship in the *querelle*.

the necessary educational qualifications. Similarly, when Rousseau notes that French music does little more than cover its melodies “d’une sorte d’accompagnement dont la prétendue mélodie n’aurait aucun rapport à celle de la partie vocale,”³⁵ he is reversing Rameau’s position so that harmony no longer serves as the base upon which everything else is built. Rather, in French music, a melody (mediocre as it may be) is written and then overwritten (in an overtly pejorative way, with the use of the terms “couvrir” and “une sorte de”—one might go so far as to say overwhelmed) by a mound of insignificant clamor. This harmonic content is noise because it is non-essential and should in fact serve as a discrete accompaniment to the melody, not as the main event. This forms an attack on the idea of authorial intent through the fundamental lack of proper guidance, as well as a general dearth of respect for the proper order of things, both of which result in complete disorder (once again alluding to the notions of *logos* and *decorum* so dear the other camp and using them to discredit that *coin*): Rameau’s use of harmony subsumes the music’s main idea, an indication that the creative source is in fact very weak and requires such masks to make it palatable. The overvaluation of accompaniment is thus a way of dealing with both an absence of strong authorship and a correlated indecisiveness (in terms of intellectual motivation and musical structure), both of which are fatal flaws according to the *coin de la reine*.

Part of the reason for valuing authorship in the *querelle* has to do with promoting strong theoretical exploration that helps further intellectual progress. Thus, following a passage that helps explain the *Lettre*’s impact on the quarrel’s considerable influence beyond the musical domain—in which the notion of an accompaniment’s proper place and of the *basse continue*’s unfitting role in French music are contrasted with Italian opera’s perfect embodiment of “unité

³⁵ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 145.

de mélodie,” all of these elements hinting at social and political parallels—, Rousseau the musician seems to momentarily take a back seat while Rousseau the author makes himself seen. In one of the letter’s most eloquent moments, Rousseau describes the perfectly-tuned scenario—all elements being in perfect concord—that allows a single melody to carry one essential idea to the mind:

Pour qu’une musique devienne intéressante, pour qu’elle porte à l’âme les sentiments qu’on y veut exciter, il faut que toutes les parties concourent à fortifier l’expression du sujet; que l’harmonie ne serve qu’à le rendre plus énergique; que l’accompagnement l’embellisse sans le couvrir ni le défigurer; que la basse, par une marche uniforme et simple, guide en quelque sorte celui qui chante et celui qui écoute, sans que ni l’un ni l’autre s’en aperçoive; il faut, en un mot, que le tout ensemble ne porte à la fois qu’une mélodie à l’oreille et qu’une idée à l’esprit.³⁶

Through this thoughtful analysis, music and eloquence are seen to be closely linked, with message and subject finding their correspondences in melody. Conceiving a rhetorical approach to music, rather than adopting a more directly musicological perspective allows Rousseau to both emphasize the link of music to language and bring the battle into his own area of expertise. Rousseau’s advocating simplicity in music and argumentation—perhaps his most prominent argument in the *Lettre*, covering in some manner both the melody-harmony debate and the much larger issues of the quarrel—is therefore illustrated both by the music he supports and by his production as an author. The clear indication that this concept is central (other than its repetition throughout the letter) is evident in the generalized nature of Rousseau’s argumentation in this passage, which also points to Rousseau’s desire for a broadened debate that uses music to extend

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 158.

beyond its boundaries. Its basis in eloquence is supported both by Rousseau's entire text forming an attempt to implement this very concept of structured debate and ultimate persuasion, and by the innate eloquence of ideal music. The subtle indication that much of what happens must take place without being noticed ("l'accompagnement... guide en quelque sorte celui qui chante et celui qui écoute, sans que ni l'un ni l'autre s'en aperçoive") supports the idea of a subtext. It also reinforces the point made earlier that Rousseau's principle of simplicity is formal—espousing a sort of clarity as applied to all five categories of eloquence, and particularly *dispositio* and *elocutio*—and does not in any way prevent an internal complexity of content. Indeed, while overall simplicity through unity of argumentation is a dominant force for Rousseau, the interplay between the bass line and the melody depicted here reveals a level of complexity that exists internally—much like the internal- and cross-referencing encouraged throughout so many of the quarrel's texts—that provides greater substance to one's overarching arguments. The motivating bass line is a nod to melody not being the sole element of importance (showcasing Rousseau's ability to extend beyond purely one-sided arguments, the latter being a central focus of his opponents' attacks), as long as the accompaniment and melody are perfectly synchronized in this ideal music—melody (the guiding thought that constitutes Rousseau's notion of authorial intent in the quarrel) always retaining the upper hand—to function exactly like eloquent discourse.

Rousseau thus plays up his advantage as a philosopher and linguist to the utmost by developing this theory of eloquent music that relies on strong authorship, respect of authorial intent and the intellectual capacity to determine new areas of exploration. The way in which Rousseau is determined to ensure that authors retain control over their own works, even in their subsequent use by others, is mirrored in his approach to philosophical exploration: regardless of

their validity, Rousseau makes a habit of pushing his points to their fullest possible extent.³⁷ This penchant to see arguments through to their logical conclusions, regardless of whether they are factually accurate,³⁸ is reminiscent of the modern-day, pejorative use of the term “rhetoric” in that it entails valuing theory, technique and structure over content—and it is one of the reasons for the *coin du roi*’s dismay and wrath. However, this approach it is in reality a valuable exercise grounded in philosophical precepts: pushing ideas to their logical end points provides a cohesive structure for debate and pushes the intellectual envelope to its fullest, while simultaneously fostering a multiplicity of areas of investigation. A written debate is certainly the best format for this type of reflection, affording the necessary leisure to developing complex lines of exploration—something which would be very difficult to accomplish without pause for

³⁷ One cannot help but notice that this is not so different from Rameau’s approach to musical theory. However, Rousseau is interested in the thought process and logic behind ideas, whereas Rameau is obsessed with using sciences to demonstrate veracity.

³⁸ For example, after establishing the ultimate beauty of an accompaniment “à l’unisson,” Rousseau proceeds to examine the two main cases where he sees Italian composers breaking away from this technique: one is complex and consists of instances in which multiple ideas are presented simultaneously, while the other has to do with musical structure. Not surprisingly, the word “harmonie” resurfaces at this moment, and the first case of a positive non-unison accompaniment is explained:

... quand la voix, roulant avec légèreté sur des cordes d’harmonie, fixe assez l’attention pour que l’accompagnement ne puisse la partager, encore alors donne-t-on tant de simplicité à cet accompagnement que l’oreille, affectée seulement d’accords agréables, n’y sent aucun chant qui puisse le distraire. (*Lettre sur la musique française*, 159.)

The resurgence of named harmony happens at a moment when Rousseau is emphasizing just how light and secondary in nature harmony should be, never distracting from the main event. In fact, the melody is so prominent in such instances that its very importance makes it impossible to include a unison-style accompaniment. Explicit naming therefore serves his purpose well. However, it is undeniably difficult to conceive of a musical moment exactly like the one Rousseau describes, in which the melody would so clearly dictate an impossibility of accompaniment “à l’unisson” that this form of harmonic accompaniment would naturally follow, nor is it likely that this type of light, harmonically-neutral yet supportive accompaniment can really be envisioned in the reader’s mind. As in several other instances, the argument does however work well theoretically, allowing Rousseau to acknowledge that an accompaniment that includes harmony is sometimes acceptable—yet rendering its existence difficult and certainly opposed to anything composed by Rameau. This is a rhetorically-smart move, as the author would surely have been attacked by his opponents for not acknowledging the possibility of good harmonic accompaniment, and can now point to this reasoning for any moments in which Italian music makes use of a somewhat complex accompaniment. Whether because of his own uncertainty or to prevent too much focus being taken away from melody, the description is unusually short, but the underlying theoretical impulse is followed through to the end.

reflection. It also serves to encourage the very close analyses, which form an integral part of the pamphleteers' counter-arguments and use the same logical grounds to locate theoretical flaws. The written format likewise ensures the greatest possible impact for the quarrel—both by allowing ideas to be pushed to their logical extremes and by encouraging wide-ranging, precise analyses in response—, and places a high value on the question of authorship as it is considered by Rousseau. Thus, Grimm takes a page from the latter, concluding the first chapter of his story of ambition and vanity in *Le Petit Prophète de Boehmischbroda* with the composition of three minuets and a significant exclamation that ironically reflects on the creator's sense of self-satisfaction: “ah, qu'il est beau d'être Auteur!”³⁹ This is an indication that *ingenium* is dangerous if contributors take themselves too seriously (as does the *petit prophète* in his capacity as a composer born out of the French school, prior to his discovery of Italian music), forecasting the battle of egos that is to come and reminding the participants that it is the content of their production (authorial intent as it exists both in music and in the quarrel's texts) and not its source that matters. So, the quarrelers assign great responsibility to all forms of intellectual creation as *ingenium*, not merely to works of critical commentary. The latter rely on the works they analyze to create an ideal type of *inventio*: respondents have a moral responsibility to seek out through philological means a text's true meaning before building upon it—thus using *memoria* to achieve creation that takes into account the originator's *ingenium*—, just as the original text must use its ability to guide its reader and interpreter—the “unité de mélodie” of its musical counterpart—to convey its ideas and convince its reader. Both music (through melody) and eloquence (through theory) are the voice of the author for Rousseau, and they must be clear enough to be understood,

³⁹ Grimm, *Le Petit Prophète de Boehmischbroda*, in *QB*, 138.

as well as respected by those who respond. This idea will go on to play an important role throughout Rousseau's writings, leading him to note its particular importance in critical writings like the ones produced in the *querelle*, whose value find themselves defended thanks to their appreciation of authorship through remarks like this one: "sans manquer de respect à l'auteur, je réfutai pleinement l'ouvrage."⁴⁰ The French use of harmony does precisely the opposite, creating unnecessary complications and obscuring authorial intent. In so doing, eloquence cannot exist—whether in linguistic or musical form—and harmony thus renders all but impossible any sort of subsequent ethical production that values original *ingenium*. Without this, evolution is no longer possible and any resulting output is fundamentally defective.

Designing a defensive harmony

Rousseau devotes the closing of his *Lettre à M. Grimm*—which constitutes close to a third of the overall letter—to Rameau. The composer's importance is therefore felt from the *querelle*'s onset but, at the same time, his position at the end of the letter constitutes a form of marginalization. In contrast with the portions of the letter examined previously, Rousseau is not addressing Grimm's text in this instance so much as he is using it to develop his own theories. The initial phase of the conversation has thus begun, with Rameau being molded to occupy a specific position, even before he is appointed as the emblem of French music. The significance of footnotes as an extra layer for the close reader is once again underscored, as Rousseau uses the second of three footnotes to indicate he is intentionally not addressing the "prétendu principe physique de l'harmonie."⁴¹ In its wording, the footnote indicates the topic will be further

⁴⁰ Rousseau, *Les Confessions*, in *Œuvres*, 190.

⁴¹ Rousseau, *Lettre à M. Grimm*, in *QB*, 109.

addressed later and thus begs for commentary, a sort of taunting by Rousseau of his opponents, and a way of placing Rameau at the heart of the debate for better or for worse. At the same time, the composer is carefully weakened, as Rousseau alludes to D'Alembert's summary of his work in the 1752 *Éléments de musique théorique et pratique suivant les principes de M. Rameau* (two years following Rameau's *Démonstration du principe d'harmonie*, partly based on his 1737 *Generation harmonique, ou traité de musique theorique et pratique*), which Rousseau presents as being far clearer than Rameau's original treatises:

Les ouvrages théoriques de M. Rameau ont ceci de fort singulier, qu'ils ont fait une grande fortune sans avoir été lus, et qu'ils le seront bien moins désormais, depuis qu'un Philosophe a pris la peine d'écrire le sommaire de la doctrine de cet Auteur.⁴²

Even before the *Lettre sur la musique française*, the notion that matters of theory belong in the hands of professionals is therefore present. This is clearly intended to demote Rameau and the partisans of French music, while establishing a sort of compartmentalization that both restricts (through the indication that those without the proper intellectual qualifications should not engage in debate) and liberates (by encouraging those who are qualified to expound on practically any topic). The reason for this becomes apparent in certain characterizations of Rameau by the other side, such as Marin's,⁴³ which put him on equal footing with the *philosophes*—a dangerous thought for the *coin de la reine*.

This technique of marginalization is reused throughout the debate by Rousseau himself, as well as other contributors. For instance, the anonymous author—who calls himself Madame

⁴² *Ibid.*, 103.

⁴³ "Rameau et les Auteurs Encyclopédistes sont des grands hommes," writes Marin in *Ce qu'on a dit, ce qu'on a voulu dire*, in *QB*, 474.

Folio—of the response to Marin’s letter, *Ce qu’on a voulu dire, Réponse de Madame Folio, à la Lettre de Monsieur ****, makes very clever use of this technique. The reply by a likely fictional character (see the note on this subject in Chapter 1) is certainly a recognition of the author’s position as one of power. To begin, he repeats “Monsieur ***,”⁴⁴ clearly making a point of it. Marin had interestingly called Madame Folio by name, rather than “Madame F***,” as was the custom, so “Madame Folio” operates a reversal through her embrace of the pseudo-anonymous form. This serves as an indication that there is a code to the debate, which Marin did not follow, and simultaneously manages to render Marin both fictional and effeminate. Indeed, not only does “Madame Folio” repeatedly refuse to address him by name,⁴⁵ but Marin himself had stated the technique of anonymity was used for invented women. The roles are thus reversed, “Madame Folio” becoming the man, and Marin becoming the anonymous, fictional woman.⁴⁶ The position of authorship is therefore closely linked to a number of dualities, all leading back to the opposition of melody (presented as Rousseau as a clear guide and assuming a position of authority as embodied by its illustrious supporters) and harmony (which takes on a defensive role that is less certain of its beliefs and therefore confusing for its listeners).

Before focusing on his opponent and the deficiencies of French harmony—well after he has posited the preeminence of melody, in a successful effort to make this duality a central point of contention—, Rousseau maintains the proper order of things by depicting the Italian style as detaining all the answers to French music’s woes. While clearly pleased to be compared to

⁴⁴ Anon., *Ce qu’on a voulu dire, Réponse de Madame Folio, à la Lettre de Monsieur ****, in *QB*, 484.

⁴⁵ The anonymous author appears to slip up, abruptly naming Marin, *Ibid.*, 486, but this is temporary and is either an oversight (which is possible, given certain other editorial inconsistencies in the text) or a way of explicitly confirming for the reader the identity of “Monsieur ***.”

⁴⁶ The reader cannot help but wonder if this clever effect did not provide some inspiration to Rousseau and his penchant for such techniques. The text’s relative sloppiness, however, likely rules out Rousseau as its author.

Cicero and imbue himself with the work of a number of past and present thinkers, as seen in Chapters 1 and 4, Rousseau is equally proud of his own original contributions.⁴⁷ After depicting the notion of “*unité de mélodie*” as his own and essential to Italian music, Rousseau proposes to show how the concept also helps determine harmony itself.⁴⁸ By telling the story of a young Italian boy, endearingly described as a “*petit bonhomme*” whose natural musical talent can only impress, Rousseau provides his reader with some entertainment after a long technical passage. In addition to supplying relief and reviving interest—the principle of variation crucial to the *coin*’s conception of both eloquence and music—the story is meant to offer factual evidence. It is more successful at achieving this goal than was the retelling of Fontenelle’s story at the very beginning of the *Lettre*. In this instance, the story is contemporary (portrayed as quite recent, in fact) and concerns the son of the head of one of the *bouffon* troupes, who has been seen and heard at the harpsichord by all of Paris. Rousseau is marked by the difference between the talented young Italian’s style and that of the usual harpsichordist, a Frenchman named Noblet.⁴⁹

... je ne doutais pas que le sieur Noblet ne fût bon harmoniste et n’accompagnât très exactement; mais quelle fut ma surprise, en observant les mains du petit bonhomme, de voir qu’il ne remplissait presque jamais les accords, qu’il supprimait beaucoup de sons et n’employait très souvent

⁴⁷ This aspect of the Enlightenment foreshadows Romanticism and is in marked opposition with French classicism, helping Rousseau to maintain the image of Rameau as the direct descendent of Lully, unwilling to adapt.

⁴⁸ This is a way for Rousseau to transition to the letter’s next big phase with a snapshot of his stance on the Italy versus France and melody versus harmony debates. He begins this shift by directly addressing his reader twice in quick succession (“J’espère, Monsieur, que vous me pardonnerez la longueur de cet article...” immediately followed by “Vous ressouvenez-vous, monsieur, d’avoir entendu...” in the next paragraph)—which marks the first time he has done so since the opening of the letter—and by mirroring the opening of his pamphlet with another anecdote. Clearly what is to come forms an important shift, and the author’s intent is reflected in these structural elements.

⁴⁹ Although there is possibly a note of irony in Rousseau’s use of the name “Noblet” as representative of what he sees as the falsely-elevated, traditionalist and uniquely-French approach to music being depicted, Charles Noblet was in fact a music teacher, as well as a harpsichordist at the *académie royale de musique*. Rousseau’s attack even led the musician to respond by publishing a sonata entitled *Les Bouffons* that parodied the Italian style.

que deux doigts, dont l'un sonnait presque toujours l'octave de la basse!
 Quoi! disais-je en moi-même, l'harmonie complète fait moins d'effet que
 l'harmonie mutilée, et nos accompagnateurs, en rendant tous les accord
 pleins, ne font qu'un bruit confus tandis que celui-ci avec moins de sons
 fait plus d'harmonie, ou du moins rend son accompagnement plus sensible
 et plus agréable!⁵⁰

Using the pretext of telling a story, Rousseau is in fact finishing the technical portion of his letter. He alluded to the poor talents of French musicians earlier but without delving into great detail. The reader now can see why: by building on his first iteration of positive harmony to present the details of what constitutes a model accompaniment, Rousseau is laying the groundwork for an attack on French music based upon its complete opposition to this very ideal. This approach satisfies Rousseau's penchant for considering topics from an inverse perspective, while allowing him to keep the reader's attention primarily centered on the brilliance of Italian music. French music therefore becomes a secondary focal point, all the while remaining the clear target of Rousseau's attack. In reading this passage filled with enthusiasm and exclamation points, one is reminded of Rousseau's recommendation just a few lines earlier that strong emotion be saved for the most important moments. In essence, Rousseau is putting his own advice—modeled on eloquence and enacted by Italian music—into action, saving explosive exclamations for his strongest outrage or, as in this case, exaltation. There is also a crescendo in the vocabulary employed, as the description moves from “il **supprimait** beaucoup de sons” to the much stronger “harmonie **mutilée**,” along with a concurrent movement from “sons,” to be understood as “bruit,” to the same idea conveyed simply through the notion of “harmonie.” One

⁵⁰ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 165.

might also notice that the end of the first exclamation centers on the simple, almost nude bass line, while the final exclamatory sentence concludes with an allusion to the goal of creating an “*accompagnement plus sensible et plus agréable*.” These parallelisms create a certain order for the eyes and ears (whether read aloud or listened to internally) and certainly play with musical notions. They also offer two scenarios with the same outcome: the first, Italian, shows how stripping harmony down to its bare bones results in perfect accompaniment, while the second, French, is posited as necessarily thought in a contrasting relation to beautiful Italian music. By presenting his case in this manner, Rousseau leads his reader to see that in both instances, Italian music emerges as the only solution. Perhaps even more important, the implied necessary adoption of Italian music by the French is achieved through the usage of war imagery and vocabulary (“*mutilée*”), and is therefore being projected as the imminent result of what has sometimes been referred to as the *guerre des bouffons*, both predicting its outcome and encouraging boldfaced attacks that leave the other side no alternative but to take a position of defense.

Rousseau then confirms that all Italian musicians use accompaniment in the way the young boy does and demonstrates through vocabulary choices such as “*épargne*” and the logical unfolding of his argument (“*je vis que..., par conséquent...*”) that the Italians are in fact beating the French at their own game of sensible, logical reasoning. Rousseau illustrates this by pointing to the bass line as the foundation of good accompaniment:

Je comprenais bien que la basse, étant le fondement de toute harmonie,
doit toujours dominer sur le reste, et que quand les autres parties

l'étouffent ou la couvrent, il en résulte une confusion qui peut rendre
l'harmonie plus sourde...⁵¹

Rousseau achieves a parallel between melody and accompaniment: what seem to matter are the top and bottom parts, the two external lines, while everything in between only renders the end result fuzzy. This allows Rousseau to show how his principle of ideal melody “helps” harmony, in essence by hiding its faults. The topic is approached through the bass line because harmony belongs squarely in the accompaniment but the mirroring of “unité de mélodie” allows the latter to be the motivating force behind all of music’s facets, even harmonic structure. The pictorial metaphor is obvious and once again reveals the debate’s mapping on past quarrels. However, this allusion is not so much a comparison to painting like the one we saw in the last chapter, as a reflection on the approaches employed to conceptualize music, and this quarrel’s use of previous methods to inform its own. In the color versus line debate of the previous century—which flourished on the floor of the académie française following its founding, continued well into the nineteenth century, and which Matisse consequently termed “the eternal battle between color and line”—⁵² which also influenced the quarrel of the Ancients and Moderns, Rousseau would be a supporter of line in the form of melody, with harmony constituting the filler or color. This is an interesting choice, for the debate centered on painting traditionally depicts color as the expression of sentiment and line as reflecting reason. Since conveying emotions is acknowledged by both *coins* as Italian music’s strong suit, Rousseau’s vision of drawing seems to drain color of its essence, but in reality it points to a difference in theoretical approaches: music cannot be divided in the fashion that painting has been, and the debate between melody and harmony is not

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 166.

⁵² Stevens, “Language vs. Color: the Brain and the Language of Visual Arts,” 178.

a question of intellect versus emotion but of which musical component is at the source of both. For Rousseau, the very force of his “*unité de mélodie*” lies in its ability to provide the intellectual appeal and clarity that is needed, while also achieving the greatest emotional impact. Harmony, on the other hand, is little more than what fills in the space between the lines, to the point of interference.⁵³ This once again provides a subtle way of guiding the debate and making it relatable for the French reader. The latter both needs this guidance and is more likely to find appealing an approach that emphasizes reason, allowing Rousseau to reach several types of readers—within and outside of his own *coin*—and achieve broad persuasion.

Another parallel exists in Rousseau’s application of simplicity to rhetorical discourse itself, where the bones of the argument are essential and should not be overshadowed by extraneous content, too great a use of distracting techniques or other secondary factors—yet an internal complexity co-exists, as already explored. Indeed, following a detailed description of the above structure and its use of fifths,⁵⁴ Rousseau concludes that “il devait y avoir quelque principe plus caché et plus fin de l’expression que je remarquais dans la simplicité de l’harmonie italienne, tandis que je trouvais la nôtre si composée, si froide et si languissante.”⁵⁵ In effect, “*unité de mélodie*” incorporates the author’s principle of simplicity, with music teaching eloquence how best to function using simple, understandable and pleasing arguments to appeal to a wide audience and provide access to its multi-layering for the advanced reader. As the latter has come to expect, Rousseau validates an alternate reading of his own text by alluding to one in

⁵³ The other side points to harmony’s complexity as providing the intellectual component but does not claim to attain—or seek—the type of emotion sought by its opponents. As we saw, the partisans of French music prefer moderation and believe that their own special brand of emotion maintains a greater connection with the French public.

⁵⁴ Rousseau perceives this as a way of simplifying the accompaniment, instead of filling it in with thirds.

⁵⁵ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 166.

the topic at hand, before introducing the next area of interest: the deficiencies of French harmony.

Following his presentation of the reasons behind the perfection of Italian harmony, born out of its melody, Rousseau shifts his focus to France. In case the reader has any doubts as to who might be at the root of anything related to French harmony, Rousseau explicitly names Rameau⁵⁶ for the second time immediately following his transition and with more than a tinge of derision:

Je me souvins alors d'avoir lu dans quelque ouvrage de M. Rameau que chaque consonance a son caractère particulier, c'est-à-dire une manière d'affecter l'âme qui lui est propre...⁵⁷

Rameau instinctively comes to mind in Rousseau's skillful depiction of the intensely cold and boring aspects of French music that precede the statement and, adding insult to injury, Rousseau is unable to remember the precise source of Rameau's theories, implying all his theoretical writings are essentially the same and unoriginal (or perhaps equally boring, like his music). Beyond playing a part in Rousseau's personal and infamous feud with Rameau, this is a way to effectively keep the reader riveted and to remind him that this is a quarrel. However, a question inevitably springs to mind: why would Rousseau risk bringing in his opponent's theories just as he has finished explaining his own theory concerning the use of fifths to simplify Italian harmony? Rousseau has the ability to depict Rameau's theories as he pleases in his letter but if

⁵⁶ The choice to name Rameau is key in that it acknowledges the composer as one of his primary adversaries. However, it is also a way of pointing a finger, in a manner Rousseau is not accustomed to doing. As Kelly points out in *Rousseau as Author*, 11, although Rousseau makes a point of being up front about having authored own works—unlike many of his contemporaries—he usually respects other authors' choice of anonymity.

⁵⁷ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 166.

he misrepresents them, he exposes himself to derision in subsequent writings.⁵⁸ However, by introducing Rameau and actually agreeing with him—not only on music’s power over the soul (though the source of this strength is obviously different for the two thinkers) but also on more technical aspects—Rousseau is ultimately able to increase the impact of his own argument:

... l’effet de la tierce n’est point le même que celui de la quinte... il s’ensuit assez évidemment que les dissonances et tous les intervalles possibles seront aussi dans le même cas. Expérience que la raison confirme, puisque toutes les fois que les rapports sont différents, l’impression ne saurait être la même.⁵⁹

The statement seems to be in complete agreement with Rameau but this is in fact a standard rhetorical technique, by which Rousseau agrees with adversary to begin—even going so far as to use terminology (“expérience que la raison confirme”) that lulls his opponents into a false state of comfort—, only to subsequently bring him down with greater force. Although there appears to be no argument in this outward concession to Rameau, the characterization does in fact allude to Rousseau’s own theory of fifths and therefore implies that his theories are supported by Rameau’s. We can also see a hint of the wrath to come, concerning harmony as a whole, as Rousseau peppers his text with words like “dissonances” and alludes to the seemingly latent clashes of “rapports” and “impression[s],” which we can only expect will transform into something actively disagreeable.⁶⁰ Of course, the location of this impending destructive force can

⁵⁸ This may precisely be a risk Rousseau is willing to take—and some of the errors later perceived in his theories could be seen as strategic, though admittedly not very convincingly—as it will at the very least ensure a strong reaction from partisans of French music.

⁵⁹ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 167.

⁶⁰ As noted in Chapter 2, Rousseau goes on to demonstrate how music with a full or “augmented” harmony weakens the desired effect and generally leads to bad music.

only be found in harmony, and the steady increase in intensity will leave little choice for the other side than to assume its defense.

Unsurprisingly, Rameau is one of harmony's strongest defenders. For the composer, music can be used as an autonomous tool. Its power is separate from that of words and seems to supersede them (though, abiding by *decorum*, must still reflect words), which is part of what frightens the *coin de la reine*: "elle inspire au Chanteur le sentiment dont il doit être affecté indépendamment des paroles... d'où l'on sera forcé de conclure que l'Harmonie est le principal moteur de ce sentiment."⁶¹ Harmony dictates modes, which result in moods, independently of its linguistic links, for Rameau. So, although for Rousseau language is the main source of French music's inability to exist in a form that would rival Italy's, another—and parallel—root cause can be found in Rameau's harmonic theories. The latter are, finally, the object of Rousseau's attack, and his next section presents harmony as a creative crutch that is abused by the French:

Il suit de tout ceci qu'après avoir bien étudié les règles élémentaires de l'harmonie, le musicien ne doit point se hâter de la prodiguer inconsidérément, ni se croire en état de composer parce qu'il sait remplir des accords, mais qu'il doit, avant que de mettre la main à l'œuvre, s'appliquer à l'étude beaucoup plus longue et plus difficile des impressions diverses que les consonances, les dissonances et tous les accords font sur les oreilles sensibles, et se dire souvent à lui-même que le grand art du compositeur ne consiste pas moins à savoir discerner dans l'occasion les sons qu'on doit supprimer, que ceux dont il faut faire usage.⁶²

⁶¹ Rameau, *Observations sur notre instinct pour la musique*, in *QB*, 1859.

⁶² Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 168.

The double meaning of “règles élémentaires” seems to indicate that Rameau’s theories are far from being as complex as they seem, and that the most inexperienced and unskilled composer feels emboldened by these theories that allow him to simply put notes together (as if the simple logic of mathematical equations could be applied here) to form the illusion of music. Subtraction, rather than addition—a vocabulary choice that plays mocking homage to Rameau’s mathematical inspiration—is the more difficult skill to master. That is to say, melody’s apparent simplicity is in fact far more complex than harmony’s flaunted difficulty. This is reiterated as Rousseau continues, describing Italian music’s “simplicité trompeuse:”

C’est en étudiant et feuilletant sans cesse les chefs-d’œuvre de l’Italie qu’il apprendra à faire ce choix exquis, si la nature lui a donné assez de génie et de goût pour en sentir la nécessité... ils chercheront les raisons de cette simplicité trompeuse, d’autant plus admirable qu’elle cache des prodiges sous une feinte négligence, et que l’*arte che tutto fa nulla si scopre*.⁶³

Here, Rousseau once again reconciles his ideal of musical simplicity with eloquence’s aspiration to educate. Creating simple music is not a simple process and requires a good deal of education. The latter is achieved by listening to Italian music. Rather than seeing dissimulation as illusory or harmful, Rousseau touts Italian music’s ability to appear simple while hiding vast complexity. At least part of the reason for this positive camouflaging seems to reside in the idea that what is hidden allows the musician, and more generally the careful listener, to make “ce choix exquis.” The educational content of music, mirroring that of argumentative discourse, is not accessible to everyone but offers vast possibilities to those with “oreilles sensibles”—and it cultivates the

⁶³ *Ibid.* The Italian is commonly translated as quoted by Edmund Spencer in his “Legend of Sir Guyon:” “The art, which all that wrought, appeared in no place,” *The Faerie Queene* in *The Complete Poetical Works*.

latter by bringing about the possibility—and the ability—to make the right choice. By citing Tasso in Italian, Rousseau pays homage to the language he so admires and thusly indicates that a French version simply could not compare to the original, using linguistic illustration to create an implication equally applicable to music. The espoused simplicity is mirrored in Rousseau's own writing style and serves as an indication to his reader that there is more to be found in his text than might be immediately evident. The implicit reverse side of the equation contained in Rousseau's claim is clear: the apparent complexity of harmony in Rameau's music and theories is equally illusory, for it hides a core of pure vacuity.

The necessary division of labor we have seen surface on a number of occasions now takes center stage to drive the point home. Although Rousseau's self-comparison with great Italian composers provides a hint of flexibility that will be examined in the next chapter, the role of each participant is unmistakable as Rousseau continues his description of the choices made by performers and the limits of their abilities:

Ce n'est pas non plus à dire que pour ce choix le musicien soit obligé de faire tous ces raisonnements, mais qu'il en doit sentir le résultat. C'est à lui d'avoir du génie et du goût pour trouver les choses d'effet; c'est au théoricien à en chercher les causes, et à dire pourquoi ce sont des choses d'effet.⁶⁴

In this depiction, compartmentalization creates an interesting disjunction between intellectual reflection and artistic production. Clearly, it is not the role of a mere musician (namely,

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

Rameau)⁶⁵ to think at any great length—at least in the French manner, which encourages defining and developing to their fullest one’s specific talents—about the fundamental aspects of his art. Doing so is what leads Rameau to believe music is a science, whereas carefully listening to his own natural talent and good taste (assuming he possessed either) might have led him to simply compose good music. By contrast, the theoretician need not necessarily possess the natural talent required of a good composer: his expertise is purely intellectual and his aim its development. This is the primary quality required to interpret and explain matters of the mind, regardless of the primary sources’ varieties. This seeming severity is tempered by Rousseau’s repeated indications of the importance of “une oreille sensible” and other factors that also confirm the necessity of a deep appreciation for one’s topic and seemingly open up the space of interpretation. However, natural or cultivated appreciation alone is not enough: years of education and thinking are necessary to grasp the profound aspects of eloquence and music, as well as to determine which of their qualities should be retained and which ones can be discarded. Rousseau again operates a reversal: rather than he—Rousseau—being a relative newcomer to musical composition, having devoted most of his life to musical practice, Rameau is the newcomer to this kind of deep intellectual debate. Similarly, with most of the “professionals” in the *coin de la reine*, depicting the situation in this manner serves to demonstrate superiority over the opposing camp as a whole.

Rallying the *philosophes* and other experts in matters theoretical leads to a strong attack that proffers bold theories in support of strong authorial intent matched by guiding melody in

⁶⁵ In instances such as these, where Rameau is alluded to but not explicitly named, Rousseau seems to be referencing his contemporaries’ tendency to remain anonymous, turning it around to diminish his opponent’s impact. This goes well with the opposition of the philosopher’s and the musician’s respective roles.

music. These elements contribute to Rousseau's ideal of simplicity, as opposed to the science-based harmony offered by Rameau, and it takes a strong guiding force to bring about such simplicity in both music and eloquence—or what Rousseau calls in the *Essai sur l'origine des langues* a “primitive énergie,” which Rameau covers up in “tous ses accords.”⁶⁶ The lack of judgment embodied by overpowering harmony is directly contrasted with the *pathos*-based persuasive force of melody examined earlier, with the latter guided by authorial intent and the former breaking away from its linguistic and intellectual sources—what allows music to speak and be persuasive—to form a sort of independent system. The result is what Rousseau refers to as the division that erodes his “unité de mélodie.” On the other side, the only option seems to be a defense constructed around harmony as foundational and (save for Rameau, whose position is unique, as we have seen) theories based more on positions of response than anything else. The *coin du roi*'s position even leads to a few internal points of contention. For instance, the *Suite des lettres sur la musique française* actually goes so far as to completely reject the link of music and language—unlike most other texts on either side—, and this is in fact a direct result of the *coin de la reine*'s work to assert this bond as essential. In the pamphlet, Fréron views harmony as leading to a certain minimization of music's force, concluding that “il s'en suivra qu'il sera de même impossible, non seulement qu'aucune idée complexe puisse être exprimée par la Musique, mais même qu'aucune idée simple reçoive le degré d'expression qui lui est propre.”⁶⁷ Only language expresses developed ideas, which supports its necessity, but music is completely denied this ability by Fréron, clearly going against Rameau's theories. Yet, the statement also supports the composer, in that minimizing this type of expressivity emphasizes music's role in expressing

⁶⁶ Rousseau, *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, 118.

⁶⁷ Fréron, *Suite des lettres sur la musique française*, in *QB*, 1029.

general sentiments—those of harmony rather than melody (which precisely deals with conveying the story or other specific notions). While there is less unity in the *coin du roi* than in the opposing camp—at least in part through Rousseau’s efforts—, there is nevertheless a sense of agreement on the big points. What seems to be a devaluing of musical expression is in fact a direct response to Rousseau’s claims of “*unité de mélodie*” and a defense of music as almost-entirely constituted of harmony. So, the theoretical field is smartly controlled by the *coin de la reine*—even in the opposition’s most forthright criticisms of its basic premises—thanks to its preemptive measures and its determination of the debate’s big shifts, and the *coin du roi* finds a sort of unity in its opposition to Rousseau and his claims, as embodied by harmony.

II. The French and Italian connections: building a linguistic bridge between eloquence and music

One way in which Rousseau exerts control over the debate is in the elaboration of theories that use music as a basis to reflect on larger questions. If there is an interdependence of eloquence and music as seen in the previous chapter, for Rousseau it is in great part due to their common sources in the realm of language. As we have seen, this is one of the reasons many thinkers resist pure music so forcefully. It is also a justification for the *querelle*’s topic and its written form, and one of the elements that reinforces the division between the two camps: the status of language is diminished by Rameau not only in the obvious sense (with music becoming the prime motivator of its own form, at the expense of its traditional linguistic inspiration) but also because of the composer’s integration of his overtures directly into the story.⁶⁸ Although this plunges the listener into the events, the more traditional and linguistically-linked approach is the

⁶⁸ See Boissou, “*Platée de Rameau à l’avant-garde d’une évolution du goût*,” in Fabiano, *La “Querelle des Bouffons” dans la vie culturelle française du XVIIIe siècle*, 38.

one used by Italian composers, which announces the motifs that will then be used throughout the piece, thus constituting a true *exordium* and making careful use of *narratio* in a far more literary fashion. So, there is a musical justification for Rousseau's approach and this further pushes the thinker to emphasize the necessary link of music to language. Derived mostly from Rousseau's theories, the idea is widely accepted, even by *coin du roi* thinkers. For instance, Caux de Cappeval, that most loyal partisan of French music, insists on the importance of written words and written notes, which is to say of publishing as validation: "On ne grave point les Opéra d'Italie: ils n'en valent pas la dépense..."⁶⁹ The published page serves as evidence of both success and worth: Italian operas are not printed; only their arias receive this honor. Written work is therefore the ultimate proof of society's approbation, in addition to being a means of engaging in the most profound, thoughtful exchanges. For both eloquence and music, the act of publication can be beneficial—rather than detrimental as one might initially suspect due to the perceived distancing created by writing—, furthering the disciplines' union and placing language at the center of both productions. Not only is the act of publication (with attribution), integral to Rousseau's vision of authorship, as we have seen, but the reverse phenomenon—authorial anonymity—is also frequently attacked. Thus, in the first section of his *Confessions* (1712-1728), Rousseau already underscores the idea, noting that Choiseul is "l'auteur caché de toutes les persécutions que j'éprouvais en Suisse."⁷⁰ This idea of anonymity as an act of cowardliness corresponds to the need for eloquence to retain its public function, without which true *ethos* is

⁶⁹ Caux de Cappeval, *Apologie du goût français, relativement à l'opéra*, in *QB*, 1565.

⁷⁰ Rousseau, *Les Confessions*, in *Œuvres*, 347.

not possible. In this sense, authorship is an act of both honesty and courage,⁷¹ which is why it must be respected.

No eloquence or music without words

Rousseau's reflection on the author's position stems from his language theories. This can be seen in the progressive development of a concept of authorial intent in the *Lettre sur la musique française* examined at the beginning of the chapter, which builds up to one of the most transitory yet essential aspects of the quarrel: the place of instrumental or "pure" music. The concept is obviously important within a debate that centers on music and its position within the profusion of human intellectual and artistic productions. However, it is also frightening in its potential usurpation of language's preeminent position, explaining why many theorists remain cautious when discussing pure music or prefer to simply ignore the issue. An espouser of free expression and certain ideals that foreshadow the arrival of Romanticism in his quarrel writings—calling for a respect of strong authorship in a way that values individual voices within each camp, defending close reading and listening as tools that subsequently empower individuals to construct good commentaries based on their own *judicium* (albeit guided appropriately), as well as considering with a degree of sincerity the public judge of both eloquence and music—, one might expect Rousseau to support pure music. However, within the *querelle* and even once it is over, he strongly warns against the form. In this posture, one can see the influence of the Ancients maintaining its hold on Rousseau and his cohorts, as well as on many of their

⁷¹ Publication is also a permanent record for posterity, a recurring theme in *Les Confessions*, such as in Rousseau's depiction of a statement that might have offended the Count of Conti (303) and which, having been published, cannot be revoked. This ties into our examination of the reader's role, as Rousseau goes on to stress the public's misreading of—or even complete fabrications concerning—his works (*Ibid.*, 304-305). The right to speak or write about a published work can only be obtained by having done the necessary close reading and paid the author the respect he is due.

opponents, with the notion that ideal music harkens back to its original fusion with language. Rousseau's reticence to accept pure music is also at least in part due to his argument with Rameau and the partisans of French music, about whom he writes: "Partout où ils verraient des notes ils trouveraient du chant, attendu qu'en effet leur chant ne serait que des notes. Voces, praetereaue nihil."⁷² Conceding to musical notes on their own an importance equal to or greater than music set to text would be problematic for Rousseau on at least two fronts: it would lessen the importance of language—and thus of literature, philosophy and thought in general—and, within the confrontation with Rameau, conceding power to pure music would amount to admitting defeat by accepting the fundamental aspect of something innate to music that is eerily independent from the motivators of intellectual creation—possibly based in harmony (melody being so closely tied to linguistic expression). So, if the voice (born out of the spoken word) no longer retains its linguistic roots, not only does melody find its importance diminished but the elemental link of music to language—along with the entire conception of eloquent music based on ancient precepts—is lost. As such, in these short last sentences closing his argument on French music's lack of melody, Rousseau has gone from attacker of French music to defender of the Ancients, melody, philosophy and possibly even a form of intellectual music that would be diametrically opposed to Rameau's vision of such a concept.⁷³ This call to battle is heeded by the *coin de la reine* and its linguistic foundations are even accepted by the other side, as we will see,

⁷² Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 145. The Latin proverb (attributed to Ovid) selected by Rousseau finds itself vigorously attacked by the *coin du roi*, which cites it repeatedly as an indication of the emptiness of Rousseau's own arguments. This reiteration of the quote, first cited in its entirety as the *Lettre*'s epigraph, is cut short—the full version being *Sunt verba et voces, praetereaue nihil* (words and voices, nothing more)—to emphasize the importance of voices (or sounds, although the link to their human source in the Latin verse is clear) and the sheer irrationality of depriving music of its necessary relation to language.

⁷³ Much like speechmakers throughout the ages who spend their time opposing proposals by the other parties in lieu of offering their own solutions, Rousseau does not give any details on how his version would function but, by focusing on discrediting Rameau's approach, nevertheless manages to weaken his opponents' position.

and as clearly stated by Estève and Morand who attack Italian music precisely because they see it as being devoid of serious linguistic inspiration, which means it cannot fulfill its rhetorical aims.⁷⁴ As such, they claim Italian music's beauty comes "de la note seule, et nullement de l'expression des paroles; que par consequent, elle ne suppose aucun sentiment à exprimer, ni à faire sentir..."⁷⁵ In this depiction, it becomes clear that Italian music—and, by extrapolation, all music that does not properly maintain its ties to language, including so-called pure music—is not so much "pure" music as it is music with its words subtracted. Thus, whether or not the argument holds up, Italian music is presented in this instance as inferior and devoid of content; it cannot express anything or achieve eloquent force without language. Rochemont agrees, pinpointing Italian music's success in its propensity to be more purely musical.⁷⁶ For him, this is the reason for the fleeting nature of its success, and one can sense that the link to words is necessary to ensure long-lasting achievements.⁷⁷

A notable exception to the full embrace of Rousseau's linguistic theories can be found in the writings of the prominent *coin de la reine* figure closest to non-partisanship: Diderot. In *Au*

⁷⁴ The *Justification de la musique française* lacks the level of musicological detail for which Estève is known in his 1752 *Nouvelle découverte du principe de l'harmonie*, which can be explained by the far broader nature of the present debate but also puts into question its attribution. The *Nouvelle découverte* presents a critique of Rameau's theory of the *corps sonore* and is in fact one of Rousseau's sources of inspiration in breaking away from Diderot's musical theories in the *Encyclopédie*. See Chartrak's presentation of Estève's theories in Estève, *Nouvelle découverte du principe de l'harmonie, avec un examen de ce que M. Rameau a publié sous le titre de Démonstration de ce principe* 1752.

⁷⁵ Morand and Estève, *Justification de la musique française*, in *QB*, 1003.

⁷⁶ See Rochemont, *Réflexions d'un patriote sur l'opéra français et sur l'opéra italien, qui présentent le parallèle du goût des deux nations dans les beaux arts*, in *QB*, 1046.

⁷⁷ There are many other, more straightforward endorsements of music's link to language, such as Rulhière's in *Jugement de l'orchestre de l'opéra*, in *QB*, 442, which reveals once again the way in which language is seen by both sides as allowing the link of music to the principles of eloquence:

Le Chant est le premier de tous les genres par ce qu'il est le plus naturel et le plus agréable. Une belle voix intéresse et cause le plaisir le plus délicat que la Musique puisse faire éprouver: nous remarquons même tous les jours que ce sont des traits qui peuvent être chantés qui jettent de l'agrément dans un morceau d'harmonie: il paraît donc nécessaire que dans chaque pays la Musique se conforme au génie de la langue.

Petit Prophète de Boemischbroda, au grand prophète Monet, Diderot posits a slightly different theory that is also based on language but examines its relation to music within each country,⁷⁸ rather than in the more global perspective espoused by Rousseau (in which the goals and attributes of ideal music are examined in their universality, even if different genres are compared). After calling for a comparison between Armide's monologue in the eponymous work by Lully⁷⁹ to an equivalent passage from an *opera seria*, Terradellas's *Nitocris*, Diderot contends that French music owes everything to its librettists, while the exact opposite is true for Italian music: "les Scènes d'*Armide* ne sont en comparaison de celles de *Nitocris*, qu'une psalmodie languissante, qu'une mélodie sans feu, sans ame, sans force et sans génie; que le Musicien de la France doit tout à son Poète; qu'au contraire le Poète de l'Italie doit tout à son Musicien,"⁸⁰ For Rousseau, this gives music too much of a deciding role. Although it supports the prominent use of *pathos* to achieve *movere* examined earlier as providing Italian music with unsurpassable strength, Diderot's conception of Italian music minimizes the role of authorship in its apparent devaluation of the written word, as it applies specifically to music.⁸¹ It also suggests that each country forms different views of music and text, which goes against Rousseau's view of

⁷⁸ See Diderot, *Au petit Prophète de Boemischbroda, au grand prophète Monet; à tous ceux qui les ont précédés et suivis, et à tous ceux qui les suivront*, in *QB*, 422-424.

⁷⁹ Although not directly historical, this approach is reminiscent of Leopold von Ranke's to come, which Grafton indicates will rely on a "critical, comparative study of the sources" (*The Footnote: A Curious History*, 89), with the aim of determining what is factual. The purposes are different here, but the sense that a close, in-depth examination through comparison can settle matters is analogous.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 423.

⁸¹ Diderot demonstrates first hand his reverence towards authorial intent in *Les Trois Chapitres, ou la vision de la nuit du mardi-gras au mercredi des cendres* (in *QB*, see in particular the end of the third chapter), in which he takes great pains to completely respect Rousseau's style and narrative, forming what is essentially a perfectly-cohesive happy ending to his colleague's *Devin du village*. The difference between the two thinkers is therefore related specifically to this phenomenon in music. It is only natural that Diderot should be skeptical about this aspect since, as we noted previously, he is one of the few thinkers who goes on to offer a defense of instrumental music, retaining an allegiance to certain of Rameau's ideas—on a purely musicological level—during and after the quarrel.

universal criteria by which all music should be considered. These points affect the relation of music and language, leading to a tacit commentary on the location of creation (or what Rameau would term “génération”): the latter is situated squarely in the intellectual domain in France, while it is purely artistic in Italy. Even though it is not identical to Rousseau’s approach, this final theoretical prong allows for a reconciliation between the two perspectives in that Diderot not only sees Italian music as truer to itself and closer to nature than its French counterpart, but also presents an almost-complete lack of intellect in the Italian version of musical production.⁸² This endorses precisely what constitutes the *coin de la reine*’s hidden methodology in the quarrel: a highly-intellectual, French approach⁸³ to the conceptualization of a domain in which the Italians set the artistic example by precisely evacuating the overly-intellectual complexities of the French style and returning to the simplicity of ancient ideals.

Most other theorists acquiesce more fully to Rousseau’s concepts. Realizing what is at stake, even thinkers like D’Alembert who favor a less radical approach, rally around Rousseau’s vision of eloquent music necessarily being based on language. Thus, in *De la Liberté de la musique*, D’Alembert offers an interpretation of Fontenelle’s famous quip, essentially using it to conclude that pure music has no real place: “Toute cette Musique purement instrumentale, sans dessein et sans objet, ne parle ni à l’esprit ni à l’ame, et mérite qu’on lui demande avec M. de

⁸² For the *coin du roi*, this is precisely one of Italian music’s downfalls, which is closely linked to the notion of authorial intent. The latter can only be derived from words, which leads Rochemont to conclude in *Reflexions d’un patriote sur l’opéra français et sur l’opéra italien*, in *QB*, 2117, that it is really only respected on the French side. Intellectual motivation cannot be in music, so music must support, while on the Italian side it supersedes.

⁸³ The similarity to Rameau’s approach is once again visible but the latter pushes the point to its furthest possible extreme, revealing the quasi-delirium for which he has become known. For him, nature all but replaces *ingenium* and *inventio* or at the very least it places a very strong emphasis on the natural part of natural talent, which he terms “cette mère des Sciences et des Arts” (*Observations sur notre instinct pour la musique et sur son principe*, in *QB*, 1744), and which ultimately is music itself.

Fontenelle, *Sonate que me veux-tu?*”⁸⁴ For D’Alembert, there exist a few exceptions to pure music’s ineffectiveness (such as its ability to produce a succession of varied feelings) but they are rare. His position here is more reactionary than his true, overarching beliefs because he realizes that the *coin de la reine* cannot concede to Rameau: a vision of music as supreme without any relation to language would annihilate the entire debate. In developing this point, D’Alembert reminds his reader of the traditional idea that music produces images and ideas within the listener but adds to this receptive effect the specific idea of “une action,”⁸⁵ returning music to its essential relationship with eloquence and the sense that it can (at least theoretically) move to action, as seen in Chapter 2. He develops the notion further in his *Réflexions sur la musique*, describing music as having evolved exactly like language and resulting in a strength that can be put to the service of both eloquence and music. Rather than directly linking music’s effects to the Ancients like Rousseau and others, D’Alembert depicts what is essentially an evolutionary model in which humans gradually linked emotions to certain sounds that could then be exploited by music to recreate those emotions. He does however retain an idea derived from the ancient conception of music, which is that this happened before language existed, presenting it in a different light: men used sounds first to express their ideas (in a fashion similar to the cries of animals), which then evolved into language, resulting in the loss of the original varied tones.⁸⁶ So, if they are to regain their original strengths, music must be acknowledged as indispensable to language and vice versa. Without this interdependence, music and eloquence would lose their purpose, leading to D’Alembert’s singular explanation of Fontenelle’s question.

⁸⁴ D’Alembert, *De la Liberté de la musique*, in *QB*, 2275.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*

⁸⁶ In this light, the citing of Chinese by Rousseau as a possible exception to the non-existence of musical language in the modern world no longer seems that far-fetched, or at least the logic behind it becomes clearer.

By conceiving of language as both the means of expression for and underlying structure of these facets, Rousseau places it at the heart of his theories and uses it as the foundation that forms a bridge between eloquence and music. His approach garners support within his *coin*, as well as from his opponents. For instance, Aubert cites Racine's *Iphigénie* as example of the French language being easy to put to music, noting that any good musician could do so with the passage of exclamations he chooses to quote. While this is a defense of French music's specificity, as attacked by Rousseau, it is also a broader acceptance of the link of language and music, which is seen as natural because both language and music are recognized as universal. Therefore, much as Diderot noted, any language will have its own music. For Aubert, there are germs of music in every culture, all from same initial source. In fact, he fundamentally accepts the ancient conception of language and music initially being one, and sees a residue of this in modern languages containing an innate musical essence—a sort of modern adaptation of an ancient precept: a good musician feels the music that corresponds to the words. Similarly, Caux de Cappeval responds to Rousseau's criticisms of the French language's decrepitude by using lots of idiomatic expressions, often italicized for added emphasis. This seems to be an indication of the language's specificity and ability to paint, as well as proof of the French side's qualifications. Being composed of true Frenchmen who are masters of their language gives the *coin* the authority and ability to understand their language and music in a way Rousseau and the Italianists simply cannot, and Rousseau's theories therefore become evidence of his own linguistically-based inadequacies. So, a number of thinkers in the *coin du roi* agree to Rousseau's Ancients-based vision of musical eloquence relying on linguistic guidance, in part because it

allows them to claim the inevitability of a music proper to France⁸⁷ and in part because Rousseau has managed to develop his theory of language in a way that connects universally across the camps, finding its justification in the most fundamental principles of eloquence. While Rousseau uses his findings to put forward his strongest attack on French music, his opponents are more often than not able to mold the very same principles to their defense.⁸⁸

In some rare instances—almost all directly resulting from the publication of Rousseau’s *Lettre sur la musique française* and written shortly thereafter—this perception encounters resistance. In such cases, the participants demonstrate an understanding of Rousseau’s unstated goals, and of his use of language to discredit French music and things French more broadly. Thus, Bonneval writes one of the strongest of these refutations and begins by summing up Rousseau’s depiction of French as unable to yield any form of music: “Son grand principe pour dégrader la Musique Française, est, que la Musique est tellement dépendante d’une Langue, que c’est d’elle qu’elle reçoit son caractère et qu’il est impossible que la langue française soit homogène à la belle Musique non seulement, mais à la Musique quelconque.” It is precisely around the notion of pure music and the idea that Rousseau uses the French language as an

⁸⁷ Writes Aubert, in defense of every language’s correspondence to its own music: “Quand ces sortes de mots se présentent au Musicien, ils s’offrent à lui vêtus, pour ainsi dire, des tons qui leur conviennent; et cela **dans toutes les Langues...**” (my emphasis, *Réfutation suivie et détaillée des principes de M. Rousseau de Genève, touchant la musique française. Adressée à lui-même, en réponse à sa Lettre*, in *QB*, 1938).

⁸⁸ The examples of this phenomenon continue beyond those cited. For instance, in their depiction of French music personified (“une Française charmante... cette aimable Dame...,” *Justification de la musique française*, in *QB*, 1084), Morand and Estève demonstrate that eloquence and music rely on linguistic tools and a written debate as the final way to settle matters. While this personification could be seen as a defense of pure music, it is quite the opposite, relying on the very fact that music depends on words to express itself. Music speaks or rather writes, in agreement with the written nature of this debate. This is clearly intended to show how both French music and the French language can effectively defend themselves by primarily relying on the effectiveness of French to convey their ideas and implicitly reminds the reader that all the participants have after all chosen to use this language as well.

excuse to attack French music—and vice versa—that Bonneval constructs his rejection of Rousseau's notions:

Et moi, je pense que la Musique, n'étant, par elle-même, que la science de varier les sons d'une manière à intéresser le cœur et quelque fois l'esprit en charmant les oreilles, abstraction de toutes paroles, elle n'a besoin du secours d'une Langue que pour être le second interprète de ce qu'elle a dû déjà exprimer, par conséquent l'insuffisance de la Langue Française n'est qu'un sophisme contre les Musiciens Français et tous les Musiciens du monde.⁸⁹

So, Bonneval offers a modified version of Rameau's vision, defending a form of music that does not rely on language as its inspiration. This is needless to say a very hard position to hold within the *coin du roi*, which values language greatly and feels the importance of French diminishing. While most partisans of French music take an approach closer to Aubert's, Bonneval holds his ground. After all, music is expressive before language even comes into play. However, he concurrently limits music's power by emphasizing its pleasing, rather than actively transformational role. In the end, words contribute to perfecting music, and specifically to making it eloquent: most listeners do not hear what Bonneval calls "toutes les nuances d'une Musique éloquente"⁹⁰ without the help of words. Language helps music achieve—and possibly even make possible for most listeners—its goal of eloquence. While most thinkers are afraid of supporting pure music because of its too-great (and uncontrollable) strength, Bonneval seems to explain his reluctant support of a linguistic bridge by the latter precisely being the only way to

⁸⁹ Bonneval, *Apologie de la musique et des musiciens français, contre les assertions peu mélodieuses, peu mesurées et mal fondées du sieur Jean-Jacques Rousseau, ci-devant citoyen de Genève*, in *QB*, 1066

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*

harness music's strength in a way accessible to the public. This is really an inverse way of looking at the situation and the two thought processes reach the same conclusion. In fact, even for Bonneval, Rousseau's language theory ends up being a very rare point of agreement in an otherwise virulent attack on his adversary's ideas, as he notes that "Quand les paroles sont jointes à la Musique, cela favorise la séduction,"⁹¹ which clearly reinforces the notion of eloquent, persuasive music based on language.

Another example of a seeming refusal of the linguistic roots of music exists with Laugier. Also writing in early 1754, he momentarily endorses pure music or at least its conception, by stating that music can result in "chants très mélodieux... sans y mettre de paroles."⁹² This is dangerous because, if the interpretation of music with words is already speculative and divisive, pure music leaves commentary vulnerable to chaos and the possible loss of rationality. Laugier appears to throw all caution to the wind, concluding the first phase of his rebuttal against Rousseau with the even stronger statement that "ce n'est point des paroles que la Musique tire son expression."⁹³ As with Bonneval's formulation, words explain what music was already intent on depicting, giving the latter remarkable power. However, for Laugier, this is a temporary detour that is achieved by abstracting music from its societal role. Music is considered in and of itself to prove that its merits (and the consideration of these) are independent of external factors. Laugier establishes a sort of modern musicological approach, for the sole purposes of examining the value of French music.⁹⁴ He then re-integrates music into society and into the quarrel,

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 1070.

⁹² Laugier, *Apologie de la musique française contre M. Rousseau*, in *QB*, 1155.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 1157.

⁹⁴ As noted in Chapter 1, Laugier will go on to co-found what is often considered the first French review of music.

acknowledging the important position occupied by language, the previous abstraction simply having served to show that music's value is independent of a country's language in a more convincing fashion than many other texts. This is because, while Laugier accepts the premises of the quarrel, he is one of the rare contributors in the *coin du roi* who does not merely counter Rousseau but offers his own theory based on the same underlying rhetorical principles. In the final analysis, he returns to the common framework and acknowledges the importance of language. In this sense, his defense of pure music is really more theoretical than actual. Similarly, when he reintegrates language into the equation, Laugier uses one of Rousseau's fundamental principles—the need for variation—to assert that the French language does in fact provide a source of variety: its lengthiness, rather than being negative, allows for greater types of harmony and pronunciation. Laugier's perspective can be summed up in French not being ill-suited to music, with the added notion that, even if it were, this would not matter because French music can still be good, as demonstrated in its brief abstraction from its socio-linguistic context. Laugier is the first to afford to music the status of a primary source, a notion that will be revisited later on in the quarrel, with the inclusion of actual musical scores, for instance. There is therefore a sense that the central topic must also be examined, not just its tangents, even if not within the debate proper. For the specific purposes of the quarrel, however, the linguistic link is ultimately not rejected in its entirety and Laugier finds himself joining the other *coin du roi* theorists in forming responses to Rousseau that are mostly defensive and informed by Rousseau's precepts.

Since the aim of this dissertation is not to weigh in on the value of the individual arguments made but rather to examine the *querelle's* overall axes and the way in which the debate's rhetorical framework helps define these, Rousseau's description of musical measures is

especially interesting in the way it contributes to the bridging between eloquence and music. While the actual words, whether or not they are set to music, are important to Rousseau, the passage of the *Lettre* on measures reveals the vital role played by all the other aspects of language (often perceived as secondary). He compares a measureless music (in which the measure is not felt or “sensible”) to a “collection confuse de mots pris au hasard et écrits sans suite, auxquels le lecteur ne trouve aucun sens parce que l’auteur n’y en a point mis.”⁹⁵ With the indication that the author’s or composer’s (or indeed the philosopher’s) intent is preeminent, Rousseau once again takes a cue from eloquence: failure to properly express oneself with words or music is a direct result of a creator’s mastery of all the tools at his disposal—beyond mere words or notes—, which cannot be minimized. The importance of properly structuring a claim in order to convince the reader or listener can be felt as Rousseau returns to his perception of music’s roots in language, inspired by the Ancients. This time, he offers explicit references to his sources in a depiction of ideal music that places the vocal variety in a position of preeminence:

Comme la musique vocale a précédé de beaucoup l’instrumentale, celle-ci a toujours reçu de l’autre ses tours de chant et sa mesure, et les diverses mesures de la musique vocale n’ont pu naître que des diverses manières dont on pouvait scander le discours et placer les brèves et les longues les unes à l’égard des autres; ce qui est très évident dans la musique grecque, dont toutes les mesures n’étaient que les formules d’autant de rythmes fournis par tous les arrangements des syllabes longues ou brèves, et des pieds dont la langue et la poésie étaient susceptibles.⁹⁶

⁹⁵ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 145.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 146.

For Rousseau, language is clearly the primary source of good music, vocal music firmly coming first (having “*précédé de beaucoup*” its instrumental counterpart) and owing its very existence to a linguistic approach (as reflected in the description of scansion in the ancient style). This goes towards the idea of the voice itself as inextricably linked to language—its primary purpose being the expression of the latter, and the two being primarily conveyed by a common organ—is itself crucial. It is obviously an inspiration for Rousseau and results in a number of parallels to his theories, including the notion of authorial intent (which is after all the expression of a voice, both literally in its transmission of linguistic content, and figuratively in its embodiment of *ingenium*) and the transition from oratory to a written form of eloquence (which is operated much in the way standard voice becomes vocal music). “Pure” music is therefore dangerous because it is so far removed from its linguistic origins and therefore fails on all levels requiring this connection, which is to say in all of music’s fundamental roles. Along these lines, not only is instrumental music born out of vocal music and duty-bound to respect the latter’s rules, but eloquent discourse is also the simultaneous direct muse for and beneficiary of good music: the linguistic motivation that exists for both eloquence and music links the two in a reciprocal fashion, serving as the conduit that both allows music to receive its marching orders from eloquence (in the form of shared goals) and, in return, develop a level of effectiveness so great that it can then serve as an example for eloquence. Rousseau increases this connection, as well as his own credibility, by citing Greek music, which is seen as the ideal form of production—combining the force of music and the effectiveness of eloquence—by those affiliated with the Ancients. In fact, this perception

of ancient Greek music seems to be widely accepted, as evidenced by the lack of refutation on the part of the Moderns in response to this particular claim.⁹⁷

The emphasis on structure, reinforced by the letter's very configuration, is difficult to overlook: a written conversation must follow certain rules in order to be eloquent and the same is true of music, which is born out of such discourse. The argument—both in its circularity and thoroughness—takes the reader directly back to the beginning of the *Lettre* and the “dent en or” story.⁹⁸ Rousseau is making good on his promise to reexamine the validity of basic claims heretofore taken for granted by returning to the most fundamental aspects of music and questioning the origins of musical forms. When reading the passage in this light, music lacking measure—much like a mass of words not benefitting from proper arrangement and failing to draw upon the appropriate rhetorical principles—is nothing more than noise. Clearly, Rousseau is taking aim at music lacking the guiding structure offered by melody and argumentation devoid of a strong point of view, which is to say French music and theory as incarnated by Rameau's contributions.⁹⁹ The careful reader can thus discern a multifaceted attack on French music, operated thanks to a linguistic link—through which bad music and ineloquent speech share the same flaws—and disguised in a deceptively simple paragraph on musical measures.

It is again worth returning to the *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, in which Rousseau continues to develop his theories of music and language after the quarrel, shedding light on the

⁹⁷ Even though there is no physical evidence as to the nature of ancient Greek music, the *coin du roi*'s infrequent attacks of the Ancients rarely evolve beyond very general comments, and do not contest the idea of Greek music achieving an ideal form to any great extent. In part, this is because the Ancients and Moderns are no longer the most central of dualities, even if the present debate's framework owes much to the illustrious quarrel.

⁹⁸ See Chapter 1 for details on Rousseau's re-telling of Fontenelle's story.

⁹⁹ The full impact of Rousseau's weakening of his adversary examined earlier is fully felt in this attack, justifying the author's view that both Rameau's music and words (through his theories) lack true *ingenium*.

choice of a musical topic and its particular ability to foster reflection in many areas, including Rousseau's own linguistic contemplations. He devotes the fifth chapter to writing, and the reader can see that even the act of writing—of the eloquent kind used during the quarrel—is deeply tied to music in the aftermath of the debate. Monotony and the proliferation of consonants, combined with “accents qui s’effacent” and a profusion of complicated (which is to say superfluous) linguistic elements, are the signs of the French language's progressive degradation. Just as in “pure” music that has lost its link to language, French has for all intents and purposes also become corrupt by coming to rely on all of its most superficial and technical aspects, losing the essence of what makes it linguistic. This is illustrated directly by musical notation and Rousseau's references to Rameau's base lines swarming with numbers, as well as the obvious cluttering of the page with too many vertical elements—caused by harmony—that draw the eye away from the all-important horizontal melody. Chords (or their representation through a *basse chiffrée*) are a visual and mental block that impedes the progress of the melody to the ear, and to the eye. The choice to engage in a written debate that centers on a musical topic is therefore well thought through at this fundamental level and allows Rousseau to derive support for his linguistic considerations from his examination of eloquence and music. The act of writing creates a distancing from its source, as can be said of musical notation, which in turn can lead to leaving behind the elements that defined both eloquence and music. Rousseau is critical of this effect and his efforts to restore the sources of music and eloquence in their written forms through his notions of unity and simplicity seem to result in a call for a similar restoration—whether it is possible or not—for language itself.¹⁰⁰

¹⁰⁰ The difficult position of both eloquence and music in their written forms can be felt throughout the chapter, as in

In fact, music is the key to determining a language's worth for Rousseau. In the next chapter of the *Essai*, Rousseau demonstrates this in his examination of linguistic accentuation:

Toute langue où l'on peut mettre plusieurs airs de musique sur les mêmes paroles n'a point d'accent musical déterminé. Si l'accent était déterminé, l'air le serait aussi. Dès que le chant est arbitraire, l'accent est compté pour rien.¹⁰¹

For Rousseau, an effective, eloquent language contains a musical aspect, and it is this musicality that determines its ability to produce specificity, as well as its overall validity. Since French cannot be musical and is barely clinging to the vestiges of possible past musicality, its eloquence has presumably vanished. As Rousseau goes on to note, no modern language (with the possible exception of Chinese) is still musical.¹⁰² This has been lost forever but Italian retains elements of its former musicality, making it a good choice for music, while French has all but lost those elements. This is precisely due to France's leadership in matters of the mind, for clarity comes at a price: "plus on s'attache à perfectionner la grammaire et la logique, plus on accélère ce progrès,

Rousseau's indication that "L'on rend ses sentiments quand on parle et ses idées quand on écrit" (*Essai sur l'origine des langues*, 73). Within this scheme, both music and eloquence, being primarily auditory forms, encounter a sort of dehumanization when written down on paper. Sound seems to be what gives them both their essence, and this is often lost on the page. In this respect, the most important aspects of eloquence really are reduced to music (in that the two are affected by the removal of their crucial musicality or auditory qualities). However, Rousseau fosters a lively rhetorical debate that transmits strong sentiments and is undeniably full of energy—normally everything that is reserved for a great speech—within the framework of a written debate. In so doing, he seems to be commenting on the conclusion of this very chapter: "En disant tout comme on l'écrirait, on ne fait plus que lire en parlant" (*Ibid*). Indeed, the *querelle des bouffons* was almost an exact reversal, successfully transferring the vividness of spoken oratory into the written form. This can only be done by creating unity, instead of the division exemplified by written versus spoken words and, to be truly successful, ultimately eloquence and music would need to be reunited, something Rousseau realizes is probably no longer feasible. As such, he posits Italian music—and especially its recitative, explored below—as achieving the best possible compromise within the musical domain. In this light, his indication that the French have no language can be seen as a belief that the French language will not be able to regain its musicality and that eloquence itself will consequently not be able to continue existing.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid*.

¹⁰² "La langue italienne, non plus que la française, n'est point par elle-même une langue musicale. La différence est seulement que l'une se prête à la musique, et que l'autre ne s'y prête pas," writes Rousseau, *Ibid.*, 79.

et que pour rendre bientôt une langue froide et monotone, il ne faut qu'établir des académies chez le peuple qui la parle."¹⁰³ With a tongue-in-cheek reference to the most French of institutions, Rousseau displays clear ambivalence towards the inevitable loss of something valuable that accompanies the necessary and positive march of progress. This mirrors his exploration of the transition from spoken to written speech. Re-injecting a droplet of ancient Greece in a written debate, writing being the furthest point from the origins of musical eloquence, is perhaps Rousseau's way of reaching a form of compromise that is acceptable—a sort of reverence towards the Ancients that accepts their worldview while not completely undoing what Enlightenment has achieved. Such a reading of Rousseau's text therefore supports Dan Edelstein's thesis that eighteenth century thinkers conceptualized their own vision of the Enlightenment precisely within the debate of Ancients versus Moderns and that a return to antiquity is both a reflection of the high level of their accomplishments—rivaling that of ancient Greece—and a way of learning from this glorious past.¹⁰⁴ Within the *querelle*, the latter is more firmly embraced than the former, as we have seen, but a certain ambivalence nevertheless clearly exists. The lens offered by returning to the Ancients is one of the ways the thinkers are able to make sense of conflicting notions, or, as Larry Norman puts it, the sublime Racine found in Homer "might help us find the sublime in Racine."¹⁰⁵

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁴ Edelstein makes the point clear from the first pages of his introduction ("while recognizing their own scientific and philosophical accomplishments, they sought to reap the benefits of past learning as well," *The Enlightenment: A Genealogy*, 3) and his view that the concept of "Enlightenment" springs from the quarrel of the Ancients and the Moderns in a "self-reflective" (2) manner is his central thesis. Not dissimilarly,

¹⁰⁵ Norman, *The Shock of the Ancient: Literature and History in Early Modern France*, 8. Concurrently (and as revealed in the title of his book), for Norman the ancient is a radical, destabilizing departure from the familiar. In the *querelle des bouffons*, the idea of the Italians being far removed and shocking is certainly similar but it is also a return to nature that always remains grounded in contemporaneity—unable to perform a complete departure—through the omnipresent musical topic.

Taken in this light, the philosophical motivation behind choosing a musical topic to ensure the *querelle*'s impact appears far more calculated from a theoretical or ideological standpoint than a mere selection from among the areas that are of current sociocultural interest.¹⁰⁶ Obviously, the central theme of the quarrel must be a popular one to achieve the desired effect and satisfy its framers' aim of mass appeal and wide participation, but it has to concurrently be in an area requiring expertise or true appreciation so as to solicit contributions from a select group of intellectual leaders. In reading the *Essai sur l'origine des langues*' chapter on writing, the parallels between the evolutions of written language and musical notation are so striking that one wonders whether this was factored into Rousseau's decision to ignite the debate, even if he had not yet developed his treatise on language. For Rousseau, the degradation of language is (counter-intuitively) most visible in its written form—because the visual requires less training and is more immediate than other media—and his description is almost certainly directly inspired by the studies he undertook of Rameau's theories, which reveal their most insufferable attributes in musical notation:

Quiconque étudiera l'histoire et le progrès des langues verra que plus les voix deviennent monotones, plus les consonnes se multiplient, et qu'aux accents qui s'effacent, aux quantités qui s'égalisent, on supplée par des combinaisons grammaticales et par de nouvelles articulations... A mesure que les besoins croissent, que les affaires s'embrouillent, que les lumières s'étendent, le langage change de caractère: il devient plus juste et moins

¹⁰⁶ Painting once again comes to mind as an obvious alternative choice. However, the closest equivalent to the transformative effect of writing in painting would be colorless drawing. Since it does not operate a transfer from one medium to another, as in the case of both music and eloquence, the parallel is not as satisfactory.

passionné; il substitue aux sentiments les idées; il ne parle plus au cœur,
mais à la raison.¹⁰⁷

The resemblance to Rousseau's discourse about music during the *querelle* is striking and—even in those chapters not devoted specifically to music—it is clear that the philosopher's reflections on music have inspired his writings on language. The consonants, which one might be tempted to link to rhythm in music, correspond to the elements that impede the natural flow of the melody (as consonants make language harder, forming obstacles to flowing speech): they are the cluttering of the musical page with numbers, as depicted during the quarrel, as well as the lines—vertical, not horizontal—formed by harmony, which is to say the stumbling blocks to the melody's (i.e. the guiding idea's) unfolding and the reason music's natural accents are impeded. Similarly, the evolution of music weakens its very essence and thus its special ability to reach the soul. The parallel linguistic process is located in a similar effect on eloquence.

Crucial to Rousseau's and the *coin de la reine*'s understanding of music is this idea that music functions like eloquence, in a relationship of equality founded in language. Thus, when Grimm gives an example of music expressing something precise and opposed to what is in the text, noting that the composer “dit par modulation plaintive tout le contraire,”¹⁰⁸ there is clearly a sense that music is a real language that is able to convey ideas. When it is improperly used, a very real contradiction thus ensues: the damage created by conflicting music is not merely that of something that does not quite fit but is rather a concurrently contradictory statement that ruins an entire idea. Indeed, Grimm goes on to sternly note that while “contresens” reveals a lack of

¹⁰⁷ Rousseau. *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, 69.

¹⁰⁸ Grimm, *Lettre sur Omphale*, in *QB*, 19. As an illustration, the author gives the sentence expressed by the music, putting music on the same level as speech in its ability to produce meaning.

understanding and intelligence on the part of the interpreter, the fault is far graver when it is committed by the creator: “le contresens... est défaut de génie et de talent dans le Musicien, surtout quand il est général et continuel...”¹⁰⁹ As seen earlier, Rousseau puts things differently so as not to afford Rameau too much credit, but he shares with Grimm a strong belief in authorial responsibility that here reveals just how closely music is connected to eloquence through language, as well as the extent to which it must abide by rhetorical principles in order not only to persuade but also to be morally and intellectually credible.

The intersection of eloquence and music through language, or the recitative

Both *coins* see recitative as the incarnation of eloquent music. How this is achieved varies depending on theoretical positions and argumentative goals, but there are points of agreement on either side. For Rousseau, the recitative’s underlying linguistic eloquence is a key to understanding the phenomenon. Conversely, its absence within the French language has a direct impact on French music, leading Rousseau to contemplate not only the merits of French and Italian recitative—a central point for the *querelle*—but also the lack of any true recitative in French opera. Obviously, the partisans of French music vigorously rebut this claim,¹¹⁰ but they do not reject the notion of a linguistic motivation, despite their embrace of self-motivated music.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 20. “Musicien” is used interchangeably by the pamphleteers to mean musician or composer and in this instance signifies the latter.

¹¹⁰ Responses to this claim from the *coin du roi* are numerous and usually focus on either depicting the Italian style of recitative as a fad (as noted previously) or claiming that the French version is in actuality far closer to the natural ideals espoused by the *coin de la reine* than is their own. Jourdan, for example, takes the second route and links Italian recitative to its specific performance style: “Nous ne saurions souffrir une déclamation trop cadencée par une Actrice précieuse et affectée qui crie son rôle au lieu de le jouer, comment voudriez-vous nous faire supporter une déclamation notée, qui ne va que par de faux éclats et des soubresauts ridicules?” (*Le Correcteur des Bouffons*, 205). The questions of simplicity and believability are at the forefront in an attempt to prove that French recitative is in fact closer to nature. There is also an attack on the relationship of eloquence and music, which thinkers in the *coin du roi* clearly understand is central: *actio* is put into question with the depiction of poor Italian performance techniques, while *ingenium* and *judicium* are attacked through the creative process that results in false brilliance.

Since thinkers from both sides agree that the chief feature of recitative is its resemblance to declamation, the close link to language is important from the onset for both *coins*.

Born from the Ancient notion of eloquence precisely being a fusion of speech and music¹¹¹—whether, as we have seen in the context of the current debate, this means a deep bond to spoken language or a form that justifies itself within the realm of a musical reality—, Rousseau’s idea that France’s inability to produce recitative is a result of linguistic problems does not come as a surprise. What is perhaps less predictable is that Rousseau does not blame French recitative’s failures on its composers, as he could easily have done to strengthen his position against Rameau and embolden his theory of strong authorship. Instead, he focuses squarely on what he sees as the root of the problem, which is the French language itself. There is clearly an order of importance in the arguments Rousseau uses to persuade his reader. Rather than take an easy shot at Rameau, here Rousseau chooses to focus on bolstering one of the main theses of his letter. The claim itself is not unexpected but its central position may be, emphasizing the importance of this line of reasoning to its author. Leading the reader down this path and taking an unexpected turn also guarantee a memorable effect and the reader’s full consideration. This reinforces the sense that it is the author’s role to ensure his reader is affected, just as music must make itself accessible without too much difficulty—which it accomplishes in good part thanks to the recitative’s embodiment of the principles of eloquence.

As he transitions his full focus to recitative—and one of the *Lettre*’s richest passages—, Rousseau indicates that, in the interest of finding a remedy to the ills of modern French music,

¹¹¹ In the *Essai sur l’origine des langues*, 66, Rousseau stresses the way in which ancient Greek was sung, not spoken. So, music is an integral part of language, and rhetoric—born out of this musical language—is clearly seen by Rousseau as influenced by music.

“il faudra tôt ou tard commencer par redescendre ou remonter au point où Lully l’avait mise.”¹¹²

If a reader unfamiliar with the author’s aesthetic theories were to begin the letter at this point, he or she might perceive this seeming ode to the originator of French opera as quite natural but, for the reader familiar with the wider range of Rousseau’s musical writings who has moreover found Rousseau to be less than a fervent admirer of Lully in other parts of the *Lettre*, the motivation behind this statement must be put into question. Along with a depiction of Lully’s music as far more natural and with purer harmony than Rameau’s compositions, Rousseau’s call for a return to Lully is hardly a real solution for French music¹¹³ but it puts the widely-revered composer in stark opposition with Rameau by bringing to mind the *querelle des lullistes et des ramistes* that took place two decades earlier. Though ultimately not a supporter of Lully, Rousseau finds the father of French opera useful in this instance and seizes the opportunity to remind his reader that Rameau may be descended from Lully but also goes against him and any positive aspects he may exemplify. Rousseau expresses nostalgia for “l’ancien récitatif” of “ce temps-là”¹¹⁴ as a more vivid, less boring form than its present iteration, and is thus able to emphasize just how far French music has travelled from its ideals and, thus, from its relation with eloquence.

Forming a central part of the discussion surrounding recitative, the reader quickly senses that the two-pronged voyage presented by Rousseau is a reflection on the relationship between music and eloquence. It takes place within the rhetorical opposition of Ancients and Moderns, while simultaneously dealing with the current state of music. On the one hand, the spiraling descent into decadence by French music experienced from that point on explains Rousseau’s

¹¹² Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 169.

¹¹³ Regardless of Rousseau’s feelings towards Lully’s music, returning to his style of composition cannot be a remedy because, as anyone familiar with the letter knows, Rousseau is very clear in indicating there is not one.

¹¹⁴ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 170.

theory that to regain any sort of value it will have to begin by “remonter au point où Lully l’avait mise” for the French—although the latter may mistakenly view this as a decline—, while on the other hand, the same conduit backwards in time would certainly amount to “redescendre” to a much lower point in the case of Italian music, which has grown in an opposite direction and evolved greatly since then. Although not explicitly mentioned, Italian music is present by inference because the virtues of Lully’s compositions, if indeed they had any, are to be found in their embodiment of the ancient ideals represented by the Italian side. This is clear as Rousseau adds, concerning recitative, that in Lully’s day “on le chantait moins, et on le déclamait davantage,”¹¹⁵ once again depicting eloquence as proof of musicality, along with a note comparing today’s performances of Lully’s operas to their original, shorter versions. There is therefore a complex layering within this reconditioned presentation of the Ancients and Moderns, in which the two most influential French composers occupy changing roles. In essence, while it was far from perfect, opera in the time of Lully was closer to Rousseau’s standard of simplicity, stemming from its having retained a bond with its linguistic roots and its full embrace of the principles of eloquence. The idea of recitative being declaimed or speech-like is capital at least in part because the lack of this quality in modern French opera—and recitatives consequently taking the form of *airs*—will become one of the chief complaints of the *coin de la reine*. D’Alembert further explains that the problem of French *airs* is specifically linguistic: they are based on unworthy words (“vides de sens”),¹¹⁶ so are not worth saving and should be banished. This deficiency is tantamount to musical and argumentative failure, resulting in nonsensical outcomes and pointing to the essential nature of the relationship between eloquence

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁶ D’Alembert, *De la Liberté de la musique*, in *QB*, 2260.

and music: for Rousseau and his cohorts, the key to the success of both disciplines lies in the strength of their bond and common ability to communicate, which dates back to their shared ancient roots and their inextricable linguistic dependence.

Rousseau goes on to propose a complex application of these principles to his concept of “unité de mélodie”¹¹⁷ and unified accompaniment, only to finish with a reinforced, if slightly modified, restatement that gives language a leading role:

De là naît encore cette parfaite correspondance de la symphonie et du chant, qui fait que tous les traits qu’on admire dans l’une ne sont que des développements de l’autre, de sorte que c’est toujours dans la partie vocale qu’il faut chercher la source de toutes les beautés de l’accompagnement. Cet accompagnement est si bien un avec le chant, et si exactement relatif aux paroles, qu’il semble souvent déterminer le jeu et dicter à l’acteur le geste qu’il doit faire, et tel qui n’aurait pu jouer le rôle sur les paroles seules le jouera très juste sur la musique, parce qu’elle fait bien sa fonction d’interprète.¹¹⁸

In a way, Rousseau reneges on his earlier admission that elements other than the melody could guide the overall structure of a musical piece.¹¹⁹ This is because he is now taking his general principle and applying it in its strictest form to examples of Italian music (which, like any good

¹¹⁷ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 158.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁹ See Chapter 1 for an analysis of the way in which Rousseau makes certain concessions in order to achieve argumentative victory.

scholar, he cites in a footnote):¹²⁰ as in eloquent discourse, for the *coin de la reine*, good music must be guided by one main idea or melody to achieve its full impact. However, Rousseau's wording is also somewhat crafty. He no longer writes about the bass line but instead comments on the "accompagnement," which designates something larger and, for Rousseau, is often simply synonymous with "harmonie." Getting his reader used to the idea that the two terms are interchangeable is a good rhetorical technique but something more seems to be taking place here. For starters, Rousseau addresses the reader who is convinced that Rameau's principles are sound and sees harmony as a guiding force by indicating that the accompaniment may indeed *seem* to be a creative force. Then, he notes that this happens when the accompaniment is used in perfect correlation with the words, which tells us that the latter are in fact the real guide (at least in so far as musical accompaniment is concerned). Next, the reader learns that the accompaniment holds a dual position as "interprète" and as helping the singers perform authentically. This reminds us that accompaniment is indeed secondary—just as interpreters are subordinated to creators—but that it also serves a vital role, since Rousseau acknowledges that a performer who could not eloquently perform the declamation of words alone would be able to do so with the help of a good musical accompaniment. Clearly, this references the notion that singing and speaking were fused in ancient Greece, and that the first great orators gave their speeches in song-like fashion, the effect of which un-sung modern speech cannot fully reproduce. Finally, even without going back to the Ancients, the passage gives music (and not just song) an important role: although it

¹²⁰ Like so: "On en trouve des exemples fréquents dans les intermèdes qui nous ont été donnés cette année, entre autres dans l'air *A un gusto da stordire*, du *Maitre de musique*; dans celui de *Son padrone*, de la *Femme orgueilleuse*, ..." Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 159. Footnotes go hand in hand with the frequent use of citation mentioned earlier. In the eighteenth century, they are increasingly becoming the location for crediting previous works. Grafton shows in *The Footnote: A Curious History* that serious works of a historical nature were seen to require footnotes (see Chapter 4, particularly pp. 97-107).

must be combined with words and follow their guidance, language combined with music is clearly stronger than it would be alone. This is why, for Rousseau and his concept of “*unité de mélodie*,” instrumental and vocal music must not be divided as he believes they have been in France. Within the framework provided by the Ancients and Moderns, the ideal relationship between music and eloquence is therefore one of complete fusion and, concurrently, one in which each of the two disciplines are acknowledged as having full-fledged roles. Language is at the source of good music but it is also music that allows language to be eloquent. While probably not fully practicable in modern times, there is a sense that the success of music—and even of eloquence—can be measured by the strength of the union achieved in this relationship, and that language is the element that both creates its necessity and—if it has itself remained eloquent, as in the case of Italian—prevents its divorce.

When Rousseau sets out to list its functions, recitative is presented as responsible for unity of action, variety of musical forms, and *decorum* or the conveyance of ideas that would be ridiculous sung in a traditional manner. The first and third functions could be conveyed through regular speech (as with the uniquely French *opéra comique*) but for Rousseau this would be unsatisfying and unrealistic:

... la transition de la parole au chant, et surtout du chant à la parole, a une dureté à laquelle l'oreille se prête difficilement, et forme un contraste choquant qui détruit toute l'illusion et par conséquent l'intérêt; car il y a une sorte de vraisemblance qu'il faut conserver, même à l'Opéra, en rendant le discours tellement uniforme que tout puisse être pris dans une langue hypothétique.¹²¹

¹²¹ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 174.

The concept of a “langue hypothétique” that constitutes the recitative and provides greater *vraisemblance* in its unreal aspect than it would if it were spoken naturally, coupled with the idea of maintaining an illusion of reality through musical means, is remarkably imbued with the theories of French classical *tragédies en musique*.¹²² During the *querelle*, the *coin de la reine* predominantly attacks the preceding century’s values, which gave birth to French opera, so Rousseau’s terminology is particularly interesting. In part, it allows him to appeal to his French reader, but the inclusion of certain concepts of French classicism also seems genuine, demonstrating his side’s willingness to embrace the best (or most useful) theories, regardless of their origins. Rousseau also tempers his statement by referring to “**une sorte de vraisemblance**,” which indicates that if concepts are taken from the *grand siècle*, they must be adapted and not merely accepted in their raw form—reaffirming that authorial originality through transformation (and this seems to be more of a shaping practice that relies on the author’s arsenal than a philosophical questioning) is a duty. Finally, Rousseau is using French theories to attack French music, thus showing the other side’s failure to abide by its own principles.

Within this context, music becomes a language¹²³ and changing to spoken words in the middle of an opera would be like abruptly switching languages. However, beyond establishing a linguistic link, Rousseau is building a relationship between eloquence and music that, in the case of recitative, requires music to perfectly fulfill its rhetorical aims in order to succeed in its intended function of believability and of cohesion through *decorum*. If properly constructed,

¹²² See Catherine Kintzler’s work on this topic in *Poétique de l’opéra français: de Corneille à Rousseau*.

¹²³ For Alain Cernuschi, this musical language even produces meaning, as detailed in his analysis of the “contresens” article in the *Encyclopédie*, in which music is presented as linguistically constructed. See *Penser la Musique dans l’Encyclopédie: Etude sur les enjeux de la musicographie des Lumières et sur ses liens avec l’Encyclopédisme*, 506.

recitative so closely resembles declamation that the illusion is complete and, in so doing, the accompaniment (i.e. harmony) becomes positive in this instance because “le secours des accords augmente l’énergie de la déclamation harmonieuse et dédommage avantageusement de ce qu’elle a de moins naturel dans les intonations.”¹²⁴ This positive force of harmony lies in its decreasing the artificiality of speaking through song by providing a context that allows recitative to function exactly like real speech within this hypothetical musical world. Its role is thus again to support, supplement, fortify and even mask, but not to directly lead. Pointing to harmony’s coupled incapacity to create and powerful ability to mask allows Rousseau to keep the concept negative overall—especially if overused—while turning it into something positive and helpful in this specific, controlled environment. Within the budding relationship of music and eloquence, harmony resembles the elements that make an orator trustworthy, such as authenticity and good character—his *ethos*. It renders recitative believable and natural within its own context, which happens to be illusory, by helping build a cohesive language of musical eloquence.

This brings us to the third and final section of Rousseau’s *Lettre sur la musique française*, devoted to the question of recitative and its perceived lack in French music. Rousseau has already alluded to the problem of French recitative being no different than an *air* in his *Lettre à M. Grimm*:

Je crois pouvoir défier tout homme d’assigner dans la Musique Française aucune différence précise qui distingue ce qu’ils appellent Récitatif de ce qu’ils appellent air.¹²⁵

¹²⁴ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 174.

¹²⁵ Rousseau, *Lettre à M. Grimm*, in *QB*, 104.

Blaming the lack of a “mesure,” which he sees evidenced in the need for a conductor beating his staff, Rousseau points to French opera’s essential flaw early in the game, and this recurring idea finds its full development in the *Lettre sur la musique française*. Once again indicating the inseparable bond between music and language, Rousseau begins by proposing to examine French musical “nomenclature,” but actually engages in a demonstration of French bias when it comes to Italian opera:

Ces grands morceaux de musique italienne qui ravissent, ces chefs-d’œuvre de génie qui arrachent des larmes, qui offrent les tableaux les plus frappants, qui peignent les situations les plus vives et portent dans l’âme toutes les passions qu’ils expriment, les Français les appellent des ariettes. Ils donnent le nom d’airs à ces insipides chansonnettes dont ils entremêlent les scènes de leurs opéras, et réservent celui de monologues par excellence à ces trainantes et ennuyeuses lamentations à qui il ne manque pour assoupir tout le monde que d’être chantées juste et sans cris.¹²⁶

As he launches the final phase of this attack, Rousseau wants to re-engage his reader and he does so by amplifying the qualities and faults of each side. The use of exaggeration and hyperbolic language (“ces chefs-d’œuvre de génie,” “ces trainantes et ennuyeuses lamentations...”) achieves this goal, while using expressions normally associated with the description of French operas (such as “ces chefs-d’œuvre de génie” and “les tableaux les plus frappants”) to surprise the reader in the revelation that they in fact apply to Italian music. Rousseau will be able to temper his statements, as he has throughout the letter, in the more technical passages and later in the quarrel, but for now he hits the reader with his strongest blow. Within this description, Italian

¹²⁶ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 170.

music is presented as fulfilling the essential ideals of eloquence (painting a picture, touching the soul), while French music is inefficacious, boring and puts its listener to sleep. The latter is the epitome of bad rhetoric and Rousseau refuses to concede even on the technical aspects: French singers are unable to complete the most basic of musical undertakings, such as singing in key.

The intensity of this introduction to the debate on recitative reflects the position Rousseau intends to take for the final phase of his *Lettre*. Whereas it was useful for Rousseau in the earlier portions of the letter to show his ability and willingness to concede certain finer points (at least in part), so as not to be completely dismissed as biased, the thinker's mission in the conclusion of his pamphlet is to leave his reader no doubt as to the strength and merits of his position. As far as partiality is concerned, Rousseau's seeming slip of the tongue in using the third-person to describe the French is, upon closer examination, a deliberate shift. This passage is in fact all about French bias based firmly in language: persisting in applying the diminutive of "ariettes" to Italian works, while using grand terms to describe their own is not a defense of national identity but a stubborn refusal to acknowledge the possibility of anything good coming from outside sources—and both are born out of and incarnated by linguistic choices. Rousseau thus operates an ingenious manipulation in which the French become the foreigners ("ils") and the patriotic thing to do is embrace Italian music as the liberator it is. Rousseau is skillfully taking his own advice—simultaneously to its dispensation—by replicating the ideals of Italian music in his discourse: his argument is simple, clear and easy to understand, and it makes use of linguistic techniques (such as vocabulary and sentence structure) to create a great impact, while building in subtleties for the advanced reader. The fact that this is a circular system (since Italian music can also be said to be fulfilling rhetorical ideals) is somewhat dissimulated by Rousseau's own

eloquence, providing the careful reader with proof of its importance in the debate: whether he is for or against the presented position, the reader is sure to experience strong emotions in reading this passage. As a result, the engaged reader has been at least in part won over by Rousseau, for he will almost certainly be moved to contribute to the debate in a manner that mirrors Rousseau's own text and thus—whether or not he is aware of this—the *philosophe's* idea of Italian music.

So, by way of introduction to a discussion on recitative, Rousseau supplies complete certainty as to his stake in the quarrel, and concurrently generates a form of confusion that leads the reader to question his perceptions of language and music, as well as France's position in the debate and beyond. The seemingly clear-cut nature of the author's position seems to reflect the simplicity of the stories portrayed in Italian operas, and gives Rousseau an entry into his examination, as it applies to airs and other musical forms, ultimately leading up to the central question of the recitative. In his description of airs, Rousseau initially seems to be calling for a sort of believability that resembles the kind Kintzler has demonstrated exists in the *tragédie en musique*—"Dans les opéras italiens tous les airs sont en situation et font partie des scènes"¹²⁷—yet, as he lists example after example, this is revealed to be only a small component of the ideal air. The idea of believability within a given context is present, but it becomes clear that by indicating that Italian airs "font partie des scènes," which is to say they are closely linked to recitative, Rousseau has something entirely different in mind: in Italian opera, airs are an integral part of the operatic form, in addition to having a logical place in the story. This not only means there is continuity between airs and recitatives but also that the former are as expressively and emotionally charged as the rest of the opera:

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*

Là c'est le langage de l'amour, non rempli de ce fade et puéril galimatias de flammes et de chaînes, mais tragique, bouillant, entrecoupé, et tel qu'il convient aux passions impétueuses. C'est sur de telles paroles qu'il sied bien de déployer toutes les richesses d'une musique pleine de force et d'expression, et de renchérir sur l'énergie de la poésie par celle de l'harmonie et du chant.¹²⁸

In fact, for Rousseau, airs are so important that, as in eloquent discourse, these are moments in which everything must come together to form the greatest possible impact. The importance of affecting the emotions with enormous force (“tragique, bouillant”) is akin to the most rousing part of an orator’s speech. Rousseau is insistent on the point because the location of this energy is a foreign concept to the French spectator: whereas French airs are a leisurely affair (or, to use Rousseau’s more assertive terminology, a “fade et puéril galimatias”), their Italian equivalents are the embodiment of vigor and emotional excitement. This is one of those unusual instances in which Rousseau recognizes that harmony has an important role to play. The acknowledgement is made possible because the manner in which harmony supports melody in Italian music has already been demonstrated and, perhaps more important, because this portion of Rousseau’s argument is in fact mostly concerned with factors other than music. First, there is everything the Italian airs transmit, which is from the domain of the affects. Then, there is the manner in which their airs are constructed, following a rhetorical model. Finally, the point that is most important here concerns the role of language: Italian airs are able to achieve great force because they are based on “l’énergie de la poésie,” a reflection of the Italian language, which makes linguistic eloquence—and consequently musical eloquence—possible. Similarly, Rousseau does not blame

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*

French composers for the state of the French air. The “galimatias” is a direct result of the poor quality of French *libretti* (something which has been credited for the success of Lully’s operas)¹²⁹ and, ultimately, the French language itself. Thus, Rousseau notes that the words to which French operas are set have no significance, leading to the same problem in their music:

... les paroles de nos ariettes, toujours détachées du sujet, ne sont qu’un misérable jargon emmiellé qu’on est trop heureux de ne pas entendre; c’est une collection faite au hasard du très petit nombre de mots sonores que notre langue peut fournir, tournés et retournés de toutes les manières, excepté de celle qui pourrait leur donner du sens... et la preuve la plus marquée que la musique française ne sait ni peindre ni parler, c’est qu’elle ne peut développer le peu de beautés dont elle est susceptible que sur des paroles qui ne signifient rien.¹³⁰

The lack of continuity and believability is problematic but what appears to be far more worrisome is the “misérable jargon emmiellé” that is a direct result of the state of the French language. Although Rousseau concludes that French music thrives (to the extent that it can) on being independent from language, this is due to the latter having become so very un-musical. It is almost as if music has had no choice but to try to find inspiration within itself, as espoused by Rameau’s theories but for very different reasons than the composer suggests, because it can no longer turn to the French language. The latter should be its muse but cannot fulfill the role due to the extent of its own degradation. Music’s descent into a state where it can “ni peindre ni parler” is one of the most worrisome effects of this linguistically-motivated decline. As we have already

¹²⁹ Quinault is often portrayed as underrated and as the real source of Lully’s success. This could be seen as indicating that mediocre *libretti* can be turned into great operas. On *libretti*, see Oliver, *The Encyclopedists as Critics of Music*, 127.

¹³⁰ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 170.

explored, these are two important functions of eloquence, and their disappearance from music as a direct result of linguistic quandaries is an indication of the direction rhetoric itself is headed. So, Rousseau points to the insufficient presence of language in French music as symptomatic of a larger problem that has resulted in the French language being stripped of its eloquence. In this light, eloquence itself is gradually becoming little more than “des paroles qui ne signifient rien,” and it is the quarrelers’ responsibility to attempt to remedy at least this portion of the problem.

Rousseau reestablishes the proper order of things by demonstrating that Italian airs are worthy of the name, while their pale French equivalents should be termed “ariettes” (an exact reversal of contemporary French appellations), as seen above and further on:¹³¹

Après les ariettes, qui font à Paris le triomphe du goût moderne, viennent
les fameux monologues qu’on admire dans nos anciens opéras...¹³²

In reestablishing the proper naming of the song types (which is a form of referencing since, as one might recollect, it is the one used by Grimm in his *Lettre sur Omphale*), Rousseau also puts the opposition back in the context of Ancients against Moderns. However, in this case the debate is internal to French music. While not a supporter of either form, Rousseau is willing to concede some beauty (of the wrong kind, as we will see, but beauty nevertheless) to Lully’s monologues, if this helps him further emphasize the ridicule of Rameau’s *airs*. The idea is that the monologue was the precursor to the French air, already imbued with many of the latter’s bad qualities but to

¹³¹ This demonstration of the absurdity of labels that are applied in exact diametrical opposition to what Rousseau sees as fact points to a deeper problem, linked to the same phenomenon in Rameau’s theories. This sense that many assumptions taken for reality are the precise opposite helps to explain the roots of Rousseau’s frequent use of subversion and reversals. While certainly born out of rhetorical principles, the philosophical quest for truth and the critical pleasure of demonstrating inverse corollaries are motivating factors. They also stress the importance of language and its position in establishing musical eloquence.

¹³² Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 171.

a lesser extent. Rousseau presents this as a combination of “le caractère traînant de la langue” and “le ton lamentable,” indicating that:

... comme la mesure ne s’y fait sentir ni dans le chant, ni dans la basse, ni dans l’accompagnement, rien n’est si traînant, si lâche, si languissant que ces beaux monologues que tout le monde admire en bâillant: ils voudraient être tristes et ne sont qu’ennuyeux; ils voudraient toucher le cœur et ne font qu’affliger les oreilles.¹³³

Building upon his enunciated precepts for good music, Rousseau is allowing his reader to put to use what he has learned from the previous parts of the letter. While someone unexposed to Rousseau’s musical theories might assume that a musical technicality is to blame for the tiring character of French monologues, the attentive reader knows that the reason for Italian music’s success in using both the melody and bass line lies in the beauty of its language and its effective embodiment of rhetorical principles. Pointing to language as the true source of the French monologue’s sleepy and lethargic temperament is validated further by thinking back to Rousseau’s earlier depiction of Lully’s music as more declaimed than sung.

The Italian recitative has yet to be broached but we can already see that the apparent simplicity of Rousseau’s discourse fulfills rhetorical ideals and hides a number of complexities, as had been predicted by the introduction to this section of the *Lettre*. In another gesture of self-referencing, whereas Rousseau began his analyses of French musical forms by first demonstrating the ideal state of Italian equivalents, he has here chosen to show the deficiencies of a French form before moving on to his presentation of the Italian equivalent. This is where the accompaniment plays an essential role, redoubling its efforts “par notes égales qui marquent le

¹³³ *Ibid.*, 172.

mouvement et... par des subdivisions de notes” to support the melody in Italian *adagi*. This energy is impossible in French music:

... la nature du chant français interdit cette ressource à nos compositeurs; car dès que l’acteur serait forcé d’aller en mesure, il ne pourrait plus développer sa voix ni son jeu, traîner son chant, renfler, prolonger ses sons, ni crier à pleine tête, et par conséquent il ne serait plus applaudi.¹³⁴

The lack of a regularity such as the one found in the Italian style, or what Rousseau refers to as “aller en mesure,” seems to be the biggest obstacle to an energetic slow form in French opera. The appeal of this argument for the French reader (especially if he is from the *coin du roi*) resides once again in Rousseau’s classicism: although the Italian version of slow movements provides greater musical variety through its contrasting accompaniment, its real beauty lies in its orderly structure as a cohesive unit. The singers’ freedom and excessive use of *rubato* may be portrayed as out of control but the temptation to see them as indicative of some sort of individualism is illusory. In applying Rousseau’s theories, one appreciates that French performers are in fact trapped by the limitations of their language and years of bad musical practices: the structure and ostensible orderliness of Italian music is born out of the composers’ ability to use words as they need, while the French singers’ seemingly bending music to their desires really masks their composers’ inability to create good music. As a result, a French composer has no choice but to count on his musicians’ cheap tricks to make his music appealing and cover up the lack of *ingenium* during *actio*. As is so often the case, this realization requires and rewards a close reading of Rousseau’s text and an acquaintance with the quarrel’s hidden theoretical undercurrents.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*

Going towards this aspect of dissimulation, we saw the way in which footnotes play a crucial part of reaching the close reader and, although participants from both sides use the technique, the concept's overuse finds some resistance from thinkers such as Ozy. In fact, he uses this concept of hiding theory in footnotes to show the ridiculousness of Rousseau's system in a humorous fashion: in a tone of scientific demonstration, Ozy constructs a false etymology purporting to prove that "bas-Bretton" is the mother of all languages—directly countering the notion of Italian as the appropriate source of music.¹³⁵ Clearly, he is aware of Rousseau's deliberate use of footnotes as well as his linguistic theories and takes the opportunity to denounce them, while also revealing his opponent's use of false science. Within this perspective, Rousseau's coded footnotes only pretend to be proof and are really complete inventions. Yet, in employing this method, Ozy is able to remain authentic to the satirical form of his intervention, just as the *merveilleux* is authentic within French opera. His theoretical statement through illustration is both epideictic discourse and, in the end, a validation Rousseau's *intended* use of footnotes, if not his subsequent perceived misuse of them throughout the quarrel. Indeed, for Rousseau, the presence of footnotes throughout the quarrel's texts is meant to work towards Diderot's idea of scientific demonstration, or what Grafton terms "the humanist's rough equivalent of the scientist's report on data."¹³⁶ The authority of the author is no longer internal to his own works—and the assurance of his accumulated knowledge—, depending instead, at least in part, on the disclosure of his sources. Combined with its written format and a literary sense of authorial intent, the *querelle*'s interest in social and cultural history—as well as the overall view by its framers that it is a serious, scholarly debate, with an aim to educate its reader—seems to

¹³⁵ Ozy, *Lettre sur celle de M. J.J. Rousseau citoyen de Genève, sur la musique*, in *QB*, 882.

¹³⁶ Grafton, *The Footnote: A Curious History*, i.

make a demand similar to the historian's use of footnotes mentioned earlier: its thinkers continue the tradition of loose referencing derived from French classicism, but add to it the burden of providing explicit proof through citations and footnotes. The latter also provide Rousseau and other contributors a way of maintaining overarching clarity in the main body of their text, without forsaking their roles as scholars and intellectual guides.

Ozy takes another page from Rousseau in his use of climate-based theories. These are derived in good part from Dubos, whom we saw greatly influences Rousseau's aesthetic theory. Indeed, in his *Réflexions critiques sur la poésie et sur la peinture*, Dubos notes that “[les] causes morales n’ont pu donner une postériorité à ces grands artisans,”¹³⁷ going on to deduce that “le climat de chaque peuple est toujours, à ce que je crois, la principale cause des inclinations et des coutumes des hommes...”¹³⁸ For Dubos, then, climate (as the primary component of “causes physiques”)—not the cultural or social factors embodied by “causes morales”—is what determines *ingenium* or artistic ability. He even proposes subtle climate variations internal to a region as explaining varying forms of *ingenium* within a given country.¹³⁹ Rousseau takes a somewhat less obviously-deterministic approach in developing his theories of language, but Dubos' underlying ideas are present in his indications that the Italians have a natural advantage over the French, and that northern countries suffer from linguistic deficiencies caused by geography. This thesis is opposed to the French view, which deeply values culture (the central component of Dubos' “causes morales”) as influencing *ingenium*, and, as we saw, sees artistic merit as independent of linguistic (which is to say, climatic) qualities. Ozy goes on to use these

¹³⁷ Dubos, *Réflexions critiques sur la poésie et sur la peinture*, v. 2, 186.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, 294.

¹³⁹ Dubos cites “la différence de l’air d’une contrée limitrophe d’une autre” (*Ibid.*, 293) as explaining such differences.

diverging approaches to develop a ridiculous solution that reflects what he sees as Rousseau's preposterous argumentation: in alluding to these climate-based linguistic theories, Ozy deepens his irony and suggests that Rousseau should move to basse Bretagne to study the perfection of its language. This again allows Ozy to accept the guiding theoretical principles put forward by his opponent, while showing how they can lead to deeply flawed conclusions. His remarks might even be intended to mock Rousseau's central notion of *unité de mélodie* with his own version of unified but absurd argumentation. As noted earlier, for the *coin du roi*, logical but incorrect conclusions are not permissible and there seems to be a call for more science and less philosophy.

Returning to Rousseau's letter, conforming to his habitual pattern, the author confirms the validity of our close reading (from moments ago, above) in the next paragraph, contrasting French music's monotony with the *opera seria*'s ability to "exprimer tous les sentiments et peindre tous les caractères avec telle mesure et tel mouvement qu'il plaît au compositeur."¹⁴⁰ This is an indication of true freedom where it belongs: at the creative source. The exaggeration used by French singers is explained, as Rousseau reveals "mouvement" to be the overpowering dictator of mood. Because changes in tempo are virtually their only way of portraying emotion, French singers draw out the slow moments as a means of increasing expressivity but, in reality, render the music inaudible to a good ear. In contrast, Italian music is not bound by a strict relationship between tempo and meaning, giving it great malleability and expressivity:

... la mélodie italienne trouve dans chaque mouvement des expressions pour tous les caractères, des tableaux pour tous les objets. Elle est, quant il plaît au musicien, triste sur un mouvement vif, gaie sur un mouvement lent

¹⁴⁰ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 172.

et, comme je l'ai déjà dit, elle change sur le même mouvement de caractère au gré du compositeur; ce qui lui donne la facilité des contrastes, sans dépendre en cela du poète et sans s'exposer à des contresens.¹⁴¹

The French problem is once again linguistic, since Italian music's ability to provide variety resides in a certain independence from the text. This may seem to go against the unity of music and language espoused by Rousseau as a partisan of the Ancients, but he is far from advocating a separation of the two. What he is addressing is a very specific aspect of music—tempo—which is not restrained by speech in Italian as it is in French. In fact, it is aided and even made possible by linguistic musicality. The very musical nature of the Italian language—born from the climate theories outlined above—is what gives it the ability to move as it pleases, whether or not it is put to music. The composer therefore has the choice of setting it to various musical forms and tempi. In this manner, Italian music is not being disloyal to its textual inspiration by not conforming to French preconceptions of certain *tempi* corresponding to specific moods. On the contrary, the freedom afforded the composer allows him to far more perfectly capture the sentiments being expressed (as seen in the introduction to the final section of the *Lettre*), while not committing the rhetorically-suicidal act of boring his listener.

So, Rousseau continues to build his arguments using previous points and increasing their effectiveness through both structural and thematic internal referencing. The parallel between this process and the author's introduction to this passage is palpable: much like the outward simplicity of the Italian recitative, Rousseau's seemingly simple statements contain much greater complexity than meets the eye. In keeping with rhetorical tradition, Rousseau's text is engaging

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 173.

and entertaining to all, but knowledge of the author's theoretical principles is the key to a full understanding of the text. Following this argumentative demonstration, which concurrently served to bolster the author's core theories and address technical aspects of French and Italian music, Rousseau returns to the main object of this section with the reader fully aware that close listening, and close reading of Rousseau's texts, are needed to unlock the significance of the Italian recitative.

Since Rameau is now the emblem of French music and the direct descendent of Lully, any forceful allegiance to Lully is dangerous for the partisans of Italian music. Perhaps of even greater significance, if language is at the root of French music's problems, how could Lully have composed better music? Rousseau anticipates this line of reasoning and seems to temporarily relieve language of its full responsibility by building upon his previous indication that French composers (namely Rameau) are equally culpable:

C'est une chose assez plaisante que d'entendre les partisans de la musique française se retrancher dans le caractère de la langue, et rejeter sur elle des défauts dont ils n'osent accuser leur idole, tandis qu'il est de toute évidence que le meilleur récitatif qui peut convenir à la langue française doit être opposé presque en tout à celui qui y est en usage... En un mot le vrai récitatif français, s'il peut y en avoir un, ne se trouvera que dans une route directement contraire à celle de Lully et de ses successeurs, dans quelque route nouvelle qu'assurément les compositeurs français, si fiers de leur faux savoir, et par conséquent si éloignés de sentir et d'aimer le véritable, ne s'aviseront pas de chercher si tôt et que probablement ils ne trouveront jamais.¹⁴²

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, 175.

Rousseau's ironic state of pleasure again puts the emphasis on the querulous nature of the debate. The "partisans de la musique française" are now quite clearly his opponents, and are depicted as cowards hiding behind language or, at the very least, caught in a labyrinth where the only real way out is to admit the faults of "leur idole." Not only does this strong attack continue to encourage equally strong participation, an important goal of the letter's final section, but it also leaves little doubt as to the identity of this French idol. The brief reprieve afforded French language is necessary to achieve this because it allows the reader to realize the real musical leader of the French side is Rameau, not Lully (whose small merits are still present in the reader's mind from a few moments earlier). Although the latter is the initiator of the problem, only Rameau has truly led music completely away from its necessary grounding in language and into its own, defective realm. Since this is what partisans of French music seem to be incomprehensibly defending by blaming the French language, "leur idole" can only be Rameau. Rousseau then portrays "faux savoir" as holding back French music, a direct allusion to Rameau that is sure to elicit the responses he seeks. Blinded by his own outrageous theories, Rameau is unable to see the artificial and unnatural aspects of his music for what they are. True knowledge ("le véritable") in music necessarily includes an emotional component, which is why Italian music seeks deep impact before all else and hides its complexity, instead of flaunting it. In stark opposition, the French version of hiding can be found in French music's partisans cowardly taking cover behind language and their music's illusory complications, for they know deep down that their music is lacking. Whether or not it is valid or demonstrable, Rousseau's argument displays acute theoretical logic and every decision made goes towards achieving his ultimate aim of persuasion. Just as briefly turning away from language served a purpose, the linking of

Rameau to Lully is necessary in order to eradicate any possibility of the former being the “route nouvelle” that could potentially result in a “vrai récitatif français.” So, in addition to ensuring full allegiance to Italian music within his cohort, Rousseau’s presentation of Rameau as the direct descendent of Lully strips French music of any perceived originality or freedom. This disrobes the *coin du roi* of characteristics that could have allowed it to counter Italian innovation with a version of its own. Indeed, no possibility of French innovation exists if Rameau is simply a continuation of Lully and, if the French language is in fact to blame (as Rousseau ultimately believes is the case), this only serves to confirm that there never was and never can be any truly good French music. Therefore, any possible pretense to revolutionize musical theory is dismissed as “faux savoir,” based on Rameau merely continuing where Lully left off and on the poor state of French remaining a constant factor. This is the direct opposite of the innovative, “vrai” recitative created by the Italians, which remains close to nature through its linguistic ties yet achieves originality by building on (rather than being a mere continuation of) ancient principles and the Italian language’s eloquent suppleness.

Thus, Rousseau has managed to counter Rameau’s likely claim of innovation without ever mentioning it explicitly, giving the Italian side full reign over innovation. He has additionally snared French recitative in an unending vicious circle: the only way for French composers to find true recitative is by returning to their language for guidance, which is bound to yield poor results. The French recitative, “vrai” or “faux,” can only be bad. By contrast, Italian “récitatif obligé” incorporates “toute la vivacité de la déclamation et toute l’énergie de l’harmonie” and can be “aussi mélodieux qu’un véritable chant; qu’il peut marquer toutes les

inflexions dont les passions les plus véhémentes animent le discours.”¹⁴³ To support this bold claim—which endows Italian recitative awesome power and responsibilities—, Rousseau focuses the remainder of this long paragraph on giving concrete examples of the musical techniques used by the Italians in order to achieve this (“à l’aide d’une marche fondamentale particulière... d’une symphonie habilement ménagée...”). Ultimately, though, he decides that a full demonstration is not possible because the French reader would be unequipped to understand it. The importance of vocabulary for Rousseau is evident and the link of music—and of eloquent discourse about music—to language far from forgotten:

... comme si quelqu’un pouvait prononcer sur un récitatif sans connaître à fond la langue à laquelle il est propre. Mais, pour entrer dans les détails, il faudrait, pour ainsi dire, créer un nouveau dictionnaire, inventer à chaque instant des termes pour offrir aux lecteurs français des idées inconnues parmi eux...¹⁴⁴

Perhaps Rousseau had already begun mulling over the idea of transforming his articles on music drafted four years earlier for the *Encyclopédie* into a dictionary. Whatever the case, in addition to redirecting the reader’s attention to the preeminence of language and reasoned thought, on a practical level, the language barrier (for the French listener of Italian opera) gives Rousseau the justification he needs to forgo fully addressing the ambitious aims he has retained for Italian

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*, 176.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 175.

recitative, to which he has added those of the air and, in fact, of the overall operatic form.¹⁴⁵ The importance (“connaître à fond la langue”) and complexity (“créer un nouveau dictionnaire, inventer... des termes”) of language also remind us that those not trained in its critical usage are not fit to engage in this debate, while on a more basic level the *coin du roi*’s likely poor knowledge of Italian discredits it from offering any real judgment as to the validity of Italian opera. Perhaps those not trained in rhetoric and philosophy or schooled in the *lettres* (i.e. the majority of the opposition) would be better off remaining part of the “lecteurs français,” relegated to a relatively-passive participation in the quarrel. This multifaceted argument is therefore a forceful attack on the opposing camp, as well as a defense of the linguistic roots of both eloquence and music, without which neither can exist.

Citing Diderot’s pamphlet referenced earlier as “un écrit adressé au petit Prophète et à ses adversaires,” in which Diderot suggests that a comparison on equal footing of a model example of music from either side could settle the quarrel, Rousseau indicates that “peu de gens pourraient suivre la comparaison.”¹⁴⁶ Nevertheless, he goes on to try to demonstrate French opera’s ineptness by examining what many consider the most beloved of French recitatives, the monologue from *Armide* “qui passe pour un chef-d’œuvre de déclamation,” and revealing the numerous flaws that are resolved by the Italian genre. In so doing, he purports to follow French opera’s own rules:

¹⁴⁵ Giving the “récitatif obligé” the ability to fully express the passions and resemble “un véritable chant” is useful to Rousseau’s goal here, but Grimm and, in the final analysis, Rousseau find a less all-encompassing role for the Italian recitative in their *Encyclopédie* articles. They agree that airs are the location of strong emotions and that recitatives are most effective when closely linked to natural speech. Grimm goes so far as to indicate that the recitative’s primary role is to provide relief from opera’s constant use of song form, which would otherwise be ineffective and unrealistic. One can therefore see how it was in fact Italian *opera buffa* that inspired what some have seen as *Le Devin du village*’s role as the precursor to *opéra comique*, despite the objections to the genre made by partisans of both *coins*, as noted earlier.

¹⁴⁶ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 177.

... comme je ne puis examiner ce morceaux sans en adopter le genre, au moins en hypothèse, c'est rendre à la musique française tout l'avantage que la raison m'a forcé de lui ôter dans le cours de cette Lettre; c'est la juger sur ses propres règles; de sorte que, quand cette scène serait aussi parfaite qu'on le prétend, on ne pourrait conclure autre chose... Il ne s'agit donc ici que de voir si l'on peut l'admettre pour bonne, au moins dans son genre...¹⁴⁷

Rousseau yet again follows a scientific approach inspired in part by Diderot's suggestion and, as he did earlier, using his opponent's techniques to disprove his claims with greater vigor. His analysis focuses on a close reading of Quinault's text and the lack of eloquence in Lully's music, based on the linguistic motivation he has outlined. Just as he promises to use French opera's own rules in his analysis of Lully's monologue, he is in fact using Rameau's scientific approach to theory for his criticism of a recitative that he indicates Rameau is known to admire: "M. Rameau l'a cité avec raison en exemple d'une modulation exacte et très bien liée."¹⁴⁸ Therefore, while the long line-by-line analysis that follows is meant to demonstrate the father of French opera's musical ineptitude, it is also a criticism of Rameau's allegiance to and amplification of Lully's experiments. Everything Lully does, Rameau does in an even more egregious fashion and, before proceeding with his detailed analysis, Rousseau locates the source of French recitative's immusical nature in its utter irreverence to poetic intent and the sentiments being expressed by the text. Neither composer respects these elements through his music, demonstrating their deficiencies, as well as the validity of Rousseau's linguistic link. Based on these factors, Rameau's praise of Lully's monologue is categorically ill placed:

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 178.

... cet éloge, appliqué au morceau dont il s'agit devient une véritable satire, et M. Rameau lui-même se serait bien gardé de mériter une semblable louange en pareil cas; car que peut-on penser de plus mal conçu que cette régularité scolastique dans une scène où l'emportement, la tendresse et le contraste des passions opposées mettent l'actrice et les spectateurs dans la plus vive agitation?¹⁴⁹

The conspicuous regularity of Lully's music does not correspond to the volatile and extreme emotions being portrayed. Such "régularité scolastique" goes hand in hand with the earlier depiction of the elementary nature of basic harmony resulting in pseudo-compositions of the most uninspired kind. Merely abiding by artificial rules of composition is absurd in any given situation, and particularly in heightened moments like this one. Thus, Rousseau's tongue in cheek commendation of Rameau for probably not wanting to receive praise for such poor work only serves to amplify the composer's flawed logic: not only does Rameau admire Lully's respect of regularity (absurd in and of itself), he also fails to see the complete disconnect between this type of music and the emotions being conveyed. The point is further developed as Rousseau continues:

Armide furieuse vient poignarder son ennemi... elle se laisse attendrir... elle oublie tous ses projets de vengeance, et n'oublie pas un seul instant sa modulation. Les réticences, les interruptions, les transitions intellectuelles que le poète offrait au musicien n'ont pas été une seule fois saisies par celui-ci.¹⁵⁰

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

Rousseau adroitly manages to render the disconnect between the message and delivery comical in its glaring obviousness. He is incensed because this constitutes treason on several levels: it reveals a complete disregard for the argument at hand from a rhetorical perspective, a lack of respect for authorial intent from a critical standpoint, and a betrayal of music's very function—through its betrayal of its linguistic roots—within a purely musical context. While neither Lully nor Rameau is able to properly move his listener through his music, Rameau's guilt goes well beyond his predecessor's and stems from philosophical or perhaps even more elemental deficiencies. In essence, if Rameau is unable to see the ridicule of using measured, highly-regulated music to convey the deepest emotions, he has clearly failed to understand the text at its most simple level. The role of language in music that seeks to be eloquent is therefore of the most fundamental sort. While Lully might be charged with the same crime, Rameau benefits from the distance afforded by the time that has elapsed, as well as the perceptual or critical distance he should possess by not having composed the opus himself. If he has an adequate ear, this should allow him to step back and hear the music for what it is. Given the very basic nature of such a task, how can Rameau be fit to comment on or participate in a debate of the *querelle's* complex nature? Through Rameau's fundamentally laughable choice, based on a lack of respect for the text and its linguistic roots, Rousseau is thus able to demonstrate that the composer lacks any real *raison*—rendering *ingenium* all but impossible—and that his proper position is certainly not to be erecting grand scientific theorems or dealing with matters of the mind. This hidden series of implications offers to the advanced reader an explanation of Rousseau's harsh indictment, while the basic logic of his claims will be apparent to almost any reader. Still, for good measure, Rousseau follows this assault with concrete examples of the recitative's

monotony from a musical perspective (such as the melody and key remaining unchanged throughout, providing no musical correspondence to changes in the character's moods), which could be his idea of judging the piece from its own perspective (*à la* Rameau), while remaining firmly grounded in his concept of musical unity. The reinforcement of this straightforward presentation, combined with the dense subtext that preceded, allows Rousseau to satisfy his ambitious rhetorical goal of reaching a wide audience. Weakening the opposition in this manner just before the final onslaught of his analysis of Lully's monologue leaves the reader predisposed to share in Rousseau's outrage or at least understand its derivation.

By including a few pages of close musical analysis, based on his language-oriented theories, Rousseau opens himself up to criticism more directly than ever before, especially from those who see themselves as musical experts.¹⁵¹ Perhaps his intent is precisely to offer another possible venue for hearty debate or to set the stage for future, post-quarrel writings that will be able to concern themselves with the technical aspects Rousseau realizes will not constitute the core of this quarrel. However, this willingness to jump head first into detailed musical analysis has two other, somewhat contradictory effects: the analysis seems intended to position Rousseau as amply qualified to delve into an area requiring a certain amount of technical expertise, while his participation as a well-educated but nevertheless non-expert contributor encourages the involvement of thinkers who might otherwise be hesitant to participate due to the seemingly specialized nature of the debate. He begins by reminding us of his essentially linguistic approach, declaring that the monologue “peut passer en effet pour un chef-d'œuvre de poésie.”¹⁵² In

¹⁵¹ This is in fact exactly what happens: Rameau answers each of Rousseau's claims in his *Analyse ramiste du monologue d'Armide*.

¹⁵² Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 178.

addition to creating a reference to Rousseau's previous demonstrations of the link between language and music, positioning Quinault as the hero of the moment and covering him with praise throughout the analysis has the effect of increasing Lully's ineptitude. Though only attacked implicitly through this analysis, Rameau takes an even greater hit, not only because he is Lully's successor but due to his not having Quinault's "beaux vers"¹⁵³ from which to find inspiration: if Lully could not make good music out of such stirring verse,¹⁵⁴ Rameau has no hope whatsoever of doing so without this linguistic substrate, especially given the extreme separation of language and music he has implemented. His betrayal of the poet's intent may not be as significant as Lully's within this context but his chances of producing anything of value are virtually inexistent, based on the inferiority of his musical and linguistic tools.

As expected, Rousseau's analysis has almost entirely to do with the discontinuity between what is being portrayed and how it is being expressed musically. He is able to address potential defenses from the partisans of French music by indicating, for instance, that Lully takes liberties at the wrong moment. Therefore, the variation that does exist in French music is not positive because the moment is inappropriate (as dictated by the text and the body of ideas contained in the storyline, which serve to guide the music). Conversely, Lully fails to recognize when variation is in fact needed. The composer also falls prey to the temptation of musically portraying certain words (such as "charme" and, not without irony, "sommeil"), which results in a failure to convey the far more important overall emotion of great furor expressed by Armide. This again points to a hierarchical system—derived from language, in which levels of meaning

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁴ Quinault is obviously portrayed in this fashion for argumentative reasons but Rousseau is also referencing the commentators who defend the French language by using the librettist as an example.

and structure must be respected—that provides guidance in eloquence as in music, and in which the overarching feelings of a character must not be forgotten or sacrificed to an ill-advised fixation on technical details. Moving to the accompaniment of Lully’s recitative, Rousseau locates a similar incongruity between it and Armide’s emotions. The accompaniment fails to mirror the sentiments and thoughts being expressed. It is virtually non-existent—or identical to its incarnation in other, less emotionally-charged instances—in those rare heightened moments that require strong orchestral support: “Armide avait tant de choses à sentir, et par conséquent l’orchestre à exprimer.”¹⁵⁵ The proper use of harmony is therefore a positive addition, as long as it respects the melody and the linguistic model, making sure to “peindre le désordre et l’agitation” when necessary, rather than keeping “toute cette agitation dans le même ton.”¹⁵⁶ Rousseau is not advocating a greater role for harmonic interventions but is simply urging its appropriate use through modulations and other variations that would serve to translate the intensification of emotions without obscuring the scene’s meaning and the author’s intent, as incarnated by the melody. Both melody and harmony must be in complete accord with their linguistic foundations in order to achieve musical eloquence.

The main point of reference for Rousseau’s criticisms being linguistic, if all human intellectual production traces its roots back to language, the man of letters obviously has the upper hand over the composer. More specifically, Rameau’s notion of fully-independent, self-generating music can be exposed as outrageous. As previously noted, Rousseau encourages non-specialists to fully participate in the quarrel by turning it into a debate that is as interested in eloquent discourse based on reason, good taste and judgment, as it is in intricate musical details.

¹⁵⁵ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 180.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 180-181.

Nevertheless, the topics examined require strong intellectual abilities above all else, clearly establishing the supremacy of the *philosophes*—here, in their role as authors and thus in a merging of the public and private spheres that supports Kelly’s analysis of authorship as a voluntary public act,¹⁵⁷ the philosopher and author finding their union in the genesis of a public discussion created through eloquence and examined in the next chapter—over other contributors, and in particular musicians. Even points that seem entirely concerned with music can in fact been seen in this light. For instance, Rousseau’s conclusion mentions in passing that he chooses to stay silent concerning the “petit air de guinguette qui est à la fin de ce monologue”¹⁵⁸ and its obvious inferiority to the beauty of the Italian air to which Lully’s monologue might be compared. While seemingly a musical argument, the statement contains some very harsh terms and is clearly intended to motivate the *coin de la reine* by instilling a refusal to hold back or mince words—as well as similarly rile up the *coin du roi* in order to create a fierce, unrestrained battle. In both cases, this entails a full embrace of authorship as a public expression (as defined by Kelly and based on his reading of scholarly works about the public sphere) of the private, i.e. a public incarnation of the philosopher’s quest for truth. One need look no further than the context of eloquent debate for a firm validation of this approach, and it is something Rousseau

¹⁵⁷ In this public debate, authorial intent is especially important for philosophers. As Kelly notes, for Rousseau, “the activity of philosophy is private” (*Rousseau as Author*, 49), while the act of authorship is public. For Kelly, this public literary activity is what constitutes Rousseau’s vision of good citizenship.

¹⁵⁸ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 182.

goes on to explore more fully in his *Confessions*.¹⁵⁹ His assertion is also, and perhaps above all else, a referential statement. The reader instantly recalls Rousseau's previous passage on France's obstinate self-exclusion from the European adoption of Italian music and this musical choice's lack of *decorum* seems to symbolize France's position as a whole: the country is unreasonable and displays poor judgment on matters musical and non-musical alike. All of the musical incongruities attacked by the *coin de la reine* are thus caused by a fundamental lack of respect for language that mirrors the country's overall defects. This is also mirrored by the manner in which these linguistic causes are tied into a decline in eloquence, for they are born out of poor argumentation and result in bad *actio*.

If this is really the case, one might wonder why the monologue from *Armide* retains its position of exemplarity in France. Rousseau's earlier theory of degradation of taste due to habit could be used to make sense of this mystery, but the author offers a new explanation based on the French pride in performance, just before proceeding with his closing statement:

Ce monologue a toujours fait, et je ne doute pas qu'il ne fit encore un grand effet au théâtre, parce que les vers en sont admirables et la situation vive et intéressante. Mais sans les bras et le jeu de l'actrice, je suis persuadé que personne n'en pourrait souffrir le récitatif, et que pareille musique a grand besoin du secours des yeux pour être supportable aux oreilles.¹⁶⁰

¹⁵⁹ In addition to the previously-cited passages, Rousseau engages in a number of reflections on the status of written work within the public and private spheres, as in such instances as his comment in his *Seconde Lettre à Voltaire* from June 1760 that "ce qu'un homme écrit à un autre il ne l'écrit pas au public" (*Les Confessions*, in *Œuvres*, 286), which is both an indication of his awareness of the special value of intentionally-published work as well as an indication—implicit but also explicit within the context of the letter, which precisely concerns the status of works published without authors' express consent—that many letters are in fact drafted with the consciousness that they will become part of the public domain.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 183.

In other words, while language is at the root of French music's degradation, it cannot be blamed for poor compositional choices. Similarly (if perhaps counter-intuitively), the composer can take no credit for any success derived from the monologue. Such success has resulted from a realization (conscious or not) on the part of the performers that great acting efforts were needed to make French music palatable. One is reminded of Rousseau's criticism of French artifice in music: all those trills and other excesses served to mask poor music and, though they were unsuccessful to Rousseau's ears, contributed equally to the French performance style that is described here. This short penultimate paragraph—seemingly a simple addition to the section on Lully's recitative that preceded—therefore continues to reward close reading with additional meanings, including one final insult thrown in the direction of the partisans of French music: while it is a historically-proven fact that Lully's monologue has always been a crowd-pleaser, Rousseau can only *assume* this is still the case. The statement leaves no room for error: French music and all it represents is so unbearable to the author that he will not be found in the venues where it is being performed and therefore has no first hand knowledge of its current success.

With the querulous nature of the debate fully present and the state of French music weakened by a lengthy but strategic attack culminating in the coalescence of Rameau and Lully, the reader can see the many threads of Rousseau's arguments come together and bind French music at the roots so tightly that the growth of its modern offshoots finds itself—in theory, at least—severely stunted. Having made a persuasive case and leaving many points for further consideration in his reader's mind, Rousseau's final objective is to bring forth his most compelling arguments. He therefore concludes his letter with a very short summation that traces music's non-existence to the lack of any melody in its language and locates its appeal in a

nationalism born out of bad habits. He also deals a final blow to Rameau, reminding us that the harmonic aspect of French music is merely a “remplissage d’écuyer” and ends with his biggest punch of all in the famous declaration: “D’où je conclus que les Français n’ont point de musique et n’en peuvent avoir, ou que si jamais ils en ont une, ce sera tant pis pour eux.”¹⁶¹ The statement is bold but, coming at the end of the letter’s long line of argumentation, also constitutes a valid and logical conclusion drawing upon all of Rousseau’s enunciated precepts, be they explicit or implicit.

The linguistic bases of Rousseau’s analyses reveal that his real area of expertise is not in music, while allowing the thinker to bring the debate onto familiar ground and encourage the intersection of other domains with musical considerations. For Rousseau, language and the intellectual considerations it permits allow for a greater understanding both of these very elements and of music. Strong authorial vision can be positive or downright destructive, as it exists in both music and philosophy. Indeed, the French language has become so degraded in its removal from its ancient origins—much as “pure” music is corrupted due to its great distance from its vocal sources—that it values the wrong elements and leads to false perceptions of *logos*, *ethos* and *pathos*: the French can no longer tell what constitutes these key elements, resulting in a serious impact on their *ingenium* and *inventio*. So, what they believe to be authorial intent is in fact the perpetuation of false ideals (rendered worse by a form of self-generation that further negates authorial intent, in the case of Rameau), resulting in poor argumentation and boring, ineffective music. Conversely, the Italian side’s close link to a language that still abides by the

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 184. This audacious statement is somewhat tempered by one last, lengthy footnote, which reiterates the impossibility of a hybrid solution: if there is one thing worse than French music itself, it is the superimposition of French words onto Italian melodies. Rousseau thus uses his final footnote to emphasize the importance of music’s linguistic ties, as well as to indicate the debate’s simultaneous call for clear-cut positions and open discussion.

principles of eloquence gives its partisans the ability to listen to and build upon previous arguments in a way that retains core values in producing the *inventio* expected of authorship. Its linguistic advantage—in the bond it retains to the original union of eloquence and music—also gives the *coin* the ability to produce arguments and music that offer clarity. Part of this conception has to do with Rousseau’s authorial theories: Kelly reveals the philosopher viewed the act of writing as a political one.¹⁶² Both the requirement of clarity and the sense of false authorship on the other side¹⁶³ work towards this link to the political realm in terms of structure and in the sense that the views expressed concerning music have hidden social and political implications. Later, with the publication of *La Nouvelle Héloïse* in 1761, Rousseau confirms this indication forcefully and publicly, in such passages as Saint-Preux’s twenty-third letter, from Paris: “L’opéra de Paris passe à Paris pour le spectacle le plus pompeux, le plus voluptueux, le plus admirable qu’inventa jamais l’art humain. C’est, dit-on, le plus superbe monument de la magnificence de Louis Quatorze. Il n’est pas si libre à chacun que vous le pensez de dire son avis sur ce grave sujet.”¹⁶⁴ Further in the novel, Rousseau’s descriptions of French opera become more detailed and the emphasis on its embodiment of affected and inherited monarchical grandeur—and its evident decline—is repeatedly emphasized. Even after the quarrel, discussions of music thus become a way of publicly attacking the crown through the act of strong authorship.

Thinking back to the crux of Rousseau’s attack on Rameau and his critique of harmony, the reader realizes that the conclusion reflects both French music’s current state of aimlessness

¹⁶² See Kelly’s *Rousseau as Author*, particularly Chapter 5, in which Rousseau is shown to view the author as a “literary citizen” who performs a “civic duty” (135) through writing. For Kelly, Rousseau’s authorship is “a model of what he understood good citizenship to be” (172).

¹⁶³ This generalized notion supports an awareness of Kelly’s indication (*Ibid.*, 9) that Voltaire, among others, was in the habit of falsely attributing works to other authors, including Rousseau.

¹⁶⁴ Rousseau, *Julie ou la Nouvelle Héloïse*, 201.

and its ongoing self-destruction under Rameau's continued guidance. Thus, looking back to a prime iteration of the critiques that lead to this conclusion—Rousseau's examination of his opponent's theories concerning the relation of intervals to the affects—, one notices that the author claims to be basing his conclusions on Rameau's own approach. Rousseau describes how intervals might be “ajoutées l'une à l'autre mal à propos,” resulting in an “augmented” harmony but also mutually weakening and dividing its effect. This theory may not be practicably demonstrable but it forms a logical correlation with Rousseau's earlier statement: following Rameau's principles (according to Rousseau), each interval has its own effect and the only logical result of combining multiple intervals is that each one's effect will be diminished by the others' presence, meaning that they will do little other than “nuire mutuellement à l'impression l'une de l'autre.”¹⁶⁵ To those who might object that perfectly-suited combinations can enhance one another, Rousseau intends for the reader to conclude that this is not possible: since each interval's effect is by definition different, there can be no common overarching effect in harmonic complexity, unlike the unity that exists in melody. Theoretically sound, Rousseau's argument is then augmented with the example of dissonance, which is transformed into the worst-case scenario and greatest moment of musical opposition (in direct contrast with unity).

This is seen in Rousseau's strong criticism of the French tendency to fill-in its music:

... toute musique où l'harmonie est scrupuleusement remplie, tout accompagnement où tous les accords sont complets, doit faire beaucoup de bruit, mais avoir très peu d'expression: ce qui est précisément le caractère de la musique française.¹⁶⁶

¹⁶⁵ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 167.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 168.

Whether or not one agrees with the conclusion or even the premise, one can easily see a link between French music's reputation of a certain *lourdeur* and the *remplissage* of accompaniment as described by Rousseau—both notions being repeated with greater emphasis in the moments leading to the *Lettre*'s last statement. The depiction goes back to the quarrel's mapping on the debate of Atticism versus Asianism explored in Chapter 1, once again linking the French allegiance towards decaying, outmoded traditions to a creative and critical stagnation that has everything to do with the state of its language. Rendering music expressive is inarguably a greater challenge for this type of music (which relies on achieving grandeur and is bound by rules that are as obsolete as the *coin*'s line of reasoning) than it is for a variety that is light and malleable. However, Rousseau concludes the paragraph by pointing to “*unité de mélodie*” as the solution for the composer who wishes to compose in the French style. Clearly, this proposal is somewhat disingenuous—since Rousseau has already posited that there can be no “*unité de mélodie*” in French music, due to the melody being based on language and the latter lacking the qualities needed for the existence of a French melody—, but by appearing to provide an answer, Rousseau shows a seeming general openness and a willingness to consider or at least acknowledge other perspectives. Having previously established that the solution cannot really be applied leads the reader to come to this realization almost subconsciously, suggesting the sole option is Rousseau's own: to adopt Italian music, the only to offer the “solution” of “*unité de mélodie*.” This solution offers the strong point of view—intellectual and musical—required by Rousseau and is the only one that can lead to musical eloquence through both the successful implementation of rhetorical principles and the retention of a strong, necessary linguistic bond

born out of its historically-endorsed regional inspiration.¹⁶⁷ By contrast, the separation of music (and even thought, in Rameau's extreme theories) from eloquence and its basis in language—represented by the supplanting of melody¹⁶⁸ by harmony—leads to the impossibility of any form of good French music.¹⁶⁹

*
**

The consequences for eloquence—which Rousseau depicts as essentially the first language, possibly musical before it was spoken and born out of strong passions and morality (music and eloquence both existing on at least two levels, one of which is a sort of moral inner voice), rather than the other way around—are even more disastrous than they are for music, with its central cogs—including music and language themselves—failing and promising little hope for restoration. For Rousseau, rediscovering and maintaining the linguistic roots of music is the first step towards finding a remedy. By advocating a debate that values authorial intent—in writing

¹⁶⁷ The climate-based model that informs Rousseau's linguistic theories is further elucidated in the *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, in which he compares the languages of the "Midi" and the north to demonstrate that inspiration comes from the south. Forming a link with the Ancients as a model, this idea of linguistic and artistic development finding its roots in Italy is confirmed in its own chapter (the eighth, albeit very short), devoted to the importance of regionalisms in linguistic development. The impact of the phenomenon on all intellectual development is emphasized: "l'espèce humaine... a pris naissance dans les pays chauds," 81.

¹⁶⁸ The supremacy of melody is central throughout the quarrel for Rousseau, as noted previously. However, its importance in the formation of the thinker's linguistic theories is redoubled here because melody is the direct result of language—through the intermediary of the vocalic, as seen in the *Essai sur l'origine des langues* (particularly in chapters 2, 4 and 12)—for Rousseau. This gives melody its authority and power, born from language's essentially moral motivations, while a division from language would instantly rob it of these functions.

¹⁶⁹ Perhaps the most common retort to this conception of eloquent music achieved through its linguistic motivation can be found in the repeated attacks on *Le Devin du village*. The latter is seen as the supreme contradiction by many *coin du roi* theorists, such as Bonneval, who notes in his *Apologie de la musique et des musiciens français*, in *QB*, 1066, that the *Devin* is in French and uses French music ("une Pastorale") to supposedly achieve all that Rousseau has espoused in his *Lettre*. How is such a project even conceivable, given all Rousseau has written about the impossibility of any good French music, based specifically on the French language's deficiencies?

and in music, as illustrated by the duality of melody and harmony—, as well as a form of musical eloquence—unified in its linguistic inspirations and aspirations, as exemplified by Italian recitative—, Rousseau seems to have both theoretical and practical aims in mind. In favoring authorship over the author and giving the written form—and especially the philological approach—a special position, yet advocating a certain simplicity of primary works based on moral grounds that will become a fundamental part of his subsequent (and more well-known) writings, he marries a French theoretical approach to an Italian perception of music. This allows the opposition of Ancients and Moderns to be somewhat rethought, through Rousseau's embrace of ancient values in production (both musical and literary), as incarnated by four of the five categories of eloquence—*dispositio*, *memoria*, *elocutio*, and *actio*—, all of which maintain their ancient forms, and his simultaneous support of a modern (and essentially-French) approach to *inventio* (which for the *coin de la reine* remains gravely out of place within music, as used by Rameau) in the elaboration of the quarrel's theoretical dimension. As a result, one of the aspects that is most objectionable to his opponents—the guiding role of the philosopher—becomes a simultaneous incarnation of certain of the *coin du roi*'s essential precepts. In offering this model, Rousseau depicts the embrace of Italian music in France as a new direction for music that is more French in spirit (both in its reestablishment of the linguistic component that allows for intellectual guidance and in a steadfast clarity that is reminiscent of the impetuses of French classicism) than is the current French genre (which has lost its link to the French values through which Rousseau analyzes Italian opera), and allows for a concurrent renewal of the discipline of rhetoric.

**Eloquence Reconsidered through Music:
the *Querelle des Bouffons* as Conversation**

I. Defending rhetoric through musical eloquence	275
Eloquence as music	275
In pursuit of the essential: removing ornamentation.....	286
A melodious return to antiquity	310
II. The quarrel as conversation.....	322
The quarrel’s hidden subtext.....	324
Reciprocity through cross-referencing.....	335
Forming a public conversation.....	354

In the previous chapters, we studied how conceptions of the relationship between eloquence and music emerge as a useful and profound framework for the debate—whether in the construction of Rousseau’s authorial theories, in the opposition of melody and harmony in a way that goes beyond the surface, in the linking of music and language and its sociocultural

implications, or in the elaboration of distinct approaches centering on the one hand on simplicity and *pathos*, and on moderated *decorum* and *bon goût* on the other—and how the thinkers begin to perceive the potential decline of eloquence. In contrast, music is recognized by both *coins* as increasing in both effectiveness and popularity. This chapter’s main objective is therefore to look at the way in which music is perceived as having thrived where eloquence is increasingly flagging,¹ and how the thinkers seek to learn the lessons music has to teach for the continued development of eloquence. It becomes increasingly apparent that defining good music often amounts to defining good rhetoric and vice versa. Thus, the chapter’s first part will examine how in both *coins*, good music is achieved through an embrace of certain ancient values—if, as always, approached differently on each side—and the near-complete stripping of non-essential aspects in order to determine what core elements are truly effective. In the final analysis, the need to protect this defining nucleus from becoming marginalized or even replaced by less essential aspects, as has been successfully accomplished in music, yields a reconsideration of what defines eloquence. The latter’s survival therefore depends on the lessons derived from its relationship with music. I will argue in the second part that the enactment of such a notion takes place through the quarrelers’ elaboration of an emerging written form of eloquence that finds itself inscribed in the art of conversation.

¹ The sense of a shift in eloquence’s position is felt in the way music is upheld as uniquely successful thanks to its embodiment of rhetorical principles, and the extent to which the latter no longer exist in works of commentary. Thus, I contend that the elaboration of theory we examined, including Rousseau’s efforts to instill respect of authorial intent, reveals a need to rethink not just the direction of French music but of written texts and the way in which they reach the reader. As we noted, the quarrel’s texts thus lead by example, and use commentary on music to show the appropriate direction for this type of written eloquence.

I. Defending rhetoric through musical eloquence

The search to restore eloquence's relevance begins with a consideration of what has allowed music—that is to say good music, as it is perceived by each *coin*—to become increasingly impactful. The thinkers then consider what makes it more than merely a set of techniques (poor rhetoric often being characterized in this manner), and how reconnecting with its ancient sources—well-known for being inexorably linked to eloquence—might translate into a contemporary form of eloquent communication.

Eloquence as music

The unique conceptualization of the intertwined relationship between eloquence and music during the *querelle des bouffons* uncovered previously revealed that its framers envisioned music as not only using the tools of eloquence but as *being* eloquence. I argue that there are strong indications the thinkers are also brought to consider the reverse relationship: how eloquence is in fact music. This is posited more subtly than the inverse relationship, both because imagining eloquence as music is an excursion into dangerous territory with the potential for a loss of the tightly-exerted control over the latter, and because this is one of the means by which the quarrel's hidden themes are introduced. One can find the germs of this notion in both *coins* through music's special abilities to touch the listener or in its relationship with the audience. For instance, from the first pages of his *Lettres d'un académicien de Bordeaux*, Castel insists on the way in which music is listened to and read—forming an implicit contrast with other similarly-conceived forms of expression, such as painting—, an indication that leads the reader to realize that works of written eloquence such as the quarrel's pamphlets must strive to achieve a similar rapport in order to be successful.

There is a sense, especially in the *coin de la reine*, that good music can teach eloquence how to achieve its aims by striving to be musical. Music's special force is often what leads the quarrel's thinkers to envision this possibility, and it is therefore unsurprising that many of the theories supporting the notion originate from the partisans of Italian music. Certain thinkers thus position music as uniquely powerful, surpassing what language alone can achieve. Along these lines, in his *Lettre sur Omphale*, Grimm notes that Destouches

aurait dû s'apercevoir qu'il avait à faire parler une Amante gémissante qui, toute outragée qu'elle est, ne peut vaincre son amour... et qu'au lieu de l'expression puérile du mot *gémir*, il fallait faire tout le chant du Monologue gémissant...²

By advocating the full, unrestrained use of music's own tools to surpass a purely linguistic expression of the given sentiment, Grimm speaks to music's unique ability to deeply affect the listener. As such, this vision gives music a leg up in achieving *delectare* and especially *movere*. In so doing, Grimm suggests that eloquence can learn from music, allowing the latter to fulfill its aim of *docere*. The point is reinforced as Grimm goes on to cite Rameau's *Acante et Céphise*, noting that "le mérite de cette dernière réflexion appartient au Musicien seul, car le Poète n'y avait pas songé."³ While music for Grimm is born out of a textual inspiration, the former is also a form of effective discourse in its own right. In fact, it is precisely this type of power that the *coin du roi* sees as dangerous, if not carefully harnessed. As previously noted, Ozy describes Rousseau as "outré dans ses jugements,"⁴ and this type of criticism is very much aimed at a type of eloquence that is born out of music that the other side repeatedly characterizes as excessive

² Grimm, *Lettre sur Omphale*, in *QB*, 32.

³ *Ibid.*, 33.

⁴ Ozy, *Lettre sur celle de M. J.J. Rousseau Citoyen de Genève, sur la Musique*, in *QB*, 871.

and inappropriately brutal. Clearly, Ozy's subsequent description of the French as too moderate is meant to be patently absurd, but he is also conscious that such moderation may well result in losing the battle. For thinkers of the *coin du roi*, the debate is judged on the wrong criteria: just like opera-goers, the readers of the quarrel—who are its ultimate judges—seem to seek out cheap thrills from the pamphlets. Music therefore reflects a societal shift and a change in what constitutes eloquence (or at least what achieves its aims) on the part of the public, explaining why the French side keeps returning to the notion of *bon goût* steeped in rationality and measure.

D'Alembert, too, considers music's special abilities but theorizes them differently than most other thinkers, at least initially, seeing the aims of *delectare* and *docere* as accomplished in recitatives but locating *movere* in airs. This is an indication for eloquence that, if it is to be as successful as good music, it must rethink the way in which it achieves its aims. It is particularly interesting that the most crucial moment in music—the central recitative—is not what achieves the most vital goal of eloquence (*movere*), which suggests that for D'Alembert, airs are more innately musical than recitatives, and thus somewhat counter-intuitively more true to their form. This is because D'Alembert is far more willing than Rousseau and many other participants to attribute to music a role that heads in the direction of “pure” music.⁵ This depiction blends certain ideas that are close to Rameau's—namely, the sense that music can achieve a sort of self-generated independence—, while retaining the *coin de la reine*'s Ancients-based framework. The question seems to be how this successful marriage can be translated back to written eloquence. One solution would be to apply Rousseau's notion of strong authorial intent, the central content

⁵ D'Alembert does place certain restraints on music, recommending against trying to evoke ideas that are not closely linked to music's main representations because they will only be understood by a few and not in a reliable fashion (*Réflexions sur la musique en général et sur la musique française en particulier*, in *QB*, 1650). In this respect, music remains very much tied to eloquence and to a model governed by linguistic and narrative authenticity.

of the pamphlets fulfilling everything but *movere*, and the guiding force behind them assuming the latter. This is admittedly speculative but it does provide further justification for the explorations of the previous chapter.

Returning to the function of the recitative, however, D'Alembert does provide us with further clues to understand the implications of his perspective—and its evolution. The first time he hears the recitative from *La Serva Padronna*, he is not very touched—positively or negatively—, unlike “l'ébranlement que les airs chantants avaient produit” (which clearly locates *movere* in these passages), but goes on to note that “Je l'écoutai plus attentivement dans les représentations suivantes, et j'y trouvai une vérité qui m'étonna; il me parut si peu différent du discours, que j'avais besoin d'une sorte d'attention pour me convaincre que ce n'était pas en effet une scène absolument parlée; je croyais entendre une conversation Italienne.”⁶ The remarkable way in which Pergolesi's recitative fools D'Alembert into believing he is hearing a conversation—to such an extent that he has to redouble his focus to be sure that it isn't—demonstrates good music's double effect, and the Italian recitative's special position: it is able to touch the listener in an awe-inspiring fashion, and it is so intense that it requires (and obtains) his full attention. The impact can be felt in D'Alembert's reaction (“j'y trouvai une vérité qui m'étonna”), illustrating just how far from what he is used to (French music) Pergolesi's music is. Although recitative is important for thinkers like Rousseau because of its unbreakable bond to language, for D'Alembert the form derives its power from being true to its own medium (retaining that initial link to Rameau)—it is the most essentially musical of an opera's components. So, D'Alembert's reaction proves that a completely French approach to listening to

⁶ D'Alembert, *De la Liberté de la musique*, in *QB*, 2247.

Italian music can only lead to its embrace. The importance of listening, which we underlined previously, is paramount, for it takes D'Alembert several tries to overcome the bad habits he has developed as a listener of French music, and to realize that intent listening—by implication opposed to the French way of listening, which simply relies on the comfort of knowing what is to come and being satisfied because one is not really playing close attention—bears immense rewards and places a high value on a sort of philological approach to *docere*. The latter can only be attained through the work of careful listening needed to reach full appreciation, which in turn leads to *delectare* and, subsequently, *movere* in the realization of the work's remarkable "vérité" in its embodiment of a conversation that can only be heard by those who have put in the effort. This is a roadmap for written eloquence to be inspired by music: if music achieves its aims by remaining true to itself and requiring close listening, eloquence too must use tools that form its core—borrowing from both literature and the most essential aspects of oratory—, rather than relying on blindly transferring techniques to writing. Eloquence, too, must engage its reader and require a philological reading that bears rewards. Not only is D'Alembert's declaration more complex than it initially seemed, without having engaged in the type of reading called for by the quarrelers—which in and of itself ensures we are receptive to the form of written eloquence being supported—, but it also specifically rewards the French public. After all, a big part of the musical example is the required close attention, which one might suppose would not be necessary for the Italian listener, who is accustomed to this type of music and thus understanding it innately. So, in a fashion, the French have an advantage by being foreigners to good music: just as we previously observed foreignness play in favor of the *coin de la reine*, this unique

position will allow the French thinker's pursuit of intellectual depth to be fulfilled in forming musical eloquence of his own.

In the twelfth chapter of the *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, Rousseau expounds on these points, providing some of the clearest evidence of his *coin's* vision of eloquence as music, linking the phenomenon once again to its ancient sources:

Ainsi la cadence et les sons naissent avec les syllabes, la passion fait parler tous les organes et pare la voix de tout leur éclat; ainsi les vers, les chants, la parole ont une origine commune. Autour des fontaines dont j'ai parlé, les premiers discours furent les premières chansons...⁷

Music (or melody), language and discourse are one and the same at their origin, but the presence of a “cadence” right from the start confirms that ideal language is necessarily both eloquent and musical, that the original language not only made use of music's unique integration of *pathos* but that this form of song also simultaneously incorporated a sort of elegant appropriateness that seems to be the precursor to *bon goût*, referenced through this notion of “cadence.” Within this depiction, eloquence as music should indeed be the goal. Rousseau develops the idea by quoting the Greek geographer Strabo: “Dire et chanter étaient autrefois la même chose, dit Strabon, ce qui montre, ajoute-t-il, que la poésie est la source de l'éloquence.”⁸ Within this ancient context of a complete union between poetry and music, “poésie” is music with a linguistic element and it is this music—which inspired Rousseau's linguistic theories examined earlier—that creates eloquence. That is why “les premier grammairiens soumissent leur art à la musique” and why a spoken text lacking its musicality is equivalent to one that has only “la moitié de sa richesse; elle

⁷ Rousseau, *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, 103.

⁸ *Ibid.*

rend des idées, il est vrai, mais pour rendre des sentiments, des images, il lui faut encore un rythme et des sons, c'est-à-dire une mélodie...”⁹ With this retrospective look at the quarrel,¹⁰ Rousseau is able to acknowledge in several instances much like this one the governing aspect of music that could only be implied and limited to very specific aspects in his quarrel texts, in a conscious effort not to provide fuel to Rameau’s supporters. Once again, the most essential aspects of eloquence are attributed to its musicality. This brings us again to the particular challenge of written eloquence, in which the musicality still exists as the reader “speaks” the text in his mind, the point of entry being visual instead of auditory. This modern form of eloquence, principally moral and requiring a relatively high level of training to be properly grasped,¹¹ is why Rousseau sees such an “étonnement” surrounding the “effets prodigieux de l’éloquence, de la poésie et de la musique parmi les Grecs.”¹² There is no equivalent to this ancient, original form but there are close parallels: on the one hand, in terms of its prodigious effect, Italian music is firmly the embodiment of ancient ideals, while, on the other, the *coin du roi*’s approach (in its emphasis on *goût*¹³ and its constant search for *decorum*) could quite possibly be the closest

⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰ As noted previously, the *Essai sur l’origine des langues* is written shortly after the quarrel, in the early 1760s, and published for the first time posthumously in 1781. Its reflections on music are heavily influenced by Rousseau’s *Lettre* and provide a sort of closure for several of the ideas he espoused during the quarrel.

¹¹ Rousseau depicts eloquence and music as requiring education precisely because they are essentially moral. In the sixteenth chapter of the *Essai sur l’origine des langues*, painting is presented as part of the physical world, not requiring this. With the listener receiving the proper education, music is able to achieve levels unmatched by other disciplines. While such power can lead music to degenerate into negative results, it is also reflective of positive progress and music’s far greater potential than an art such as painting that can only represent directly what the artist sees. If guided by a moral creator, eloquence as music is the ultimate means of reaching a reader’s soul.

¹² Rousseau, *Essai sur l’origine des langues*, 103. This “étonnement” towards the prodigious effect of ancient music also supports Dan Edelstein’s aforementioned thesis that there is a “shock” of the ancient.

¹³ The importance of *bon goût* as a uniquely French quality is repeatedly stressed, not just as an idea that the French have been the arbiters of taste but also that their long cultural history is what allows it to exist. Thus, Caux de Cappeval cleverly notes that “con gusto” (*Apologie du goût français, relativement à l’opéra*, in *QB*, 1564) is an unnecessary marking—the lack of which had been pointed out by Rousseau—for French musicians who benefit from this enculturation, while its use in Italian music reveals no such characteristic.

equivalent to the conceptual and moral ideals of Greek eloquence, as they are transferred to the quarrel's innately more complex written format.¹⁴ In a sense, modern evolution has led to a separation of content from its musical execution: the *coin de la reine*'s inspiration and the guiding forces of French intellectual production find their theoretical correlation in an intellectually-complex approach that is not dissimilar to Rameau's, but the incarnation of their ideals is reflected in Italian music's ability to be "vrai"—a real conversation—as D'Alembert described it.

Rousseau leaves clues to this fully-developed point of view in the *Lettre sur la musique française*. Following his mocking suggestion that *bouffon* operas might as well be compared to French farces, which have none of the qualities of the Italian genre, Rousseau makes a seemingly off-the-cuff remark¹⁵ before returning to the question of "unité de mélodie." It concerns the *intermèdes musicaux* (which is to say light *opere buffe* such as *La Serva Padronna*) performed on French soil, which Rousseau has resigned himself to using in place of *opera seria* (the far more serious, long format Italian equivalent of *tragédies lyriques* so idealized by the *coin de la reine*) during the quarrel: "il faut aussi rendre justice à l'art avec lequel les compositeurs ont souvent évité, dans ces intermèdes, les pièges qui leur étaient tendus par les poètes, et ont fait

¹⁴ Although he never explicitly acknowledges it, Rousseau's use of French concepts seems to indicate an awareness that the French approach has merits. The *coin du roi* certainly sees itself as the embodiment of the Ancients' moral precepts. For instance, Castel establishes a hierarchy—"Le vrai, le bon, le beau composent le parfait, etc." (*Lettres d'un académicien de Bordeaux sur le fonds de la musique, à l'occasion de la Lettre de M. R*** contre la musique française*, in *QB*, 1421)—that clearly privileges morality. Thus, "le vrai" comes first, even though "le beau" (as the means of achieving *delectare*) traditionally occupies the first position in music, proving eloquence and its moral aspects to be front and center. The proper respect of this hierarchy allows for *decorum* (perhaps incarnated by the idea that "le parfait" is a balanced dosing of each quality). It also suggests that rhetoric and music can achieve equal footing, if the latter is able to reprioritize its goals, forming a circular motion in which one discipline justifies the other.

¹⁵ It is often in these digressions—much as in the use of footnotes—that larger philosophical issues are concealed.

tourner au profit de la règle des situations qui semblaient les forcer à l'enfreindre.”¹⁶ In a more general context, one might be tempted to see this as an endorsement of music’s separation from and power over text that does not coincide with Rousseau’s usual views, but in the specific case of the musical *intermède*, this is an indication of just how talented Italy’s composers are, and how eloquent music can be made to be. They deal with notoriously poor text (as tends to be the case with lighter genres) and still manage to produce exemplary music, while enhancing the said text. In this sense, music influences rhetoric in its ability to be more adept than the latter. Although Rousseau is not usually as open about music leading the way, in this instance he bases such a possibility on good music being appropriately led by melody. This places the emphasis on unity and equality, rather than on a relationship in which one of the two arts seeks to surpass the other—a clear superiority of music over rhetoric (and, consequently, language), as Rameau would have it, is rejected but there is a sense that music is able to be more eloquent than eloquence or at least that the latter can find its essence in music.

Throughout his *Lettre*, Rousseau traces the history of written language, with the alphabet and its subsequent refinements corresponding to modern civilization and suspiciously resembling the evolution of musical notation.¹⁷ Just like the latter, modern writing using a common alphabet across multiple countries was conceived to allow “une communication plus facile avec d’autres peuples parlant d’autres langues.”¹⁸ Through this conceptualization of global communication, the idea of eloquence as music becomes even stronger. After all, eloquent speech is the ultimate way

¹⁶ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 163.

¹⁷ Indeed, Rousseau is fiercely critical of musical notation—which goes against his required simplicity and in the direction of André’s artificial and arbitrary—and, as we will see a little further on, develops his own scheme to try to solve what he sees as the great artificiality and complication of the current system.

¹⁸ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 170.

of conveying complex ideas and of creating a debate, while music is the art that most seems to want to convey something beyond mere representation, as we saw in our analysis of its differences with painting. Music has an imitative quality but it is far less restricted to direct depiction than painting, dance or even theatre. Its structure is the closest to words as conveying ideas. The strongest evidence of this is found in music's evolution into something too elaborate (with Rameau), much as rhetoric's reliance on technique seems to have gone too far for its own good by the time Rousseau publishes his *Lettre sur la musique française*, as we will see in the section on the essential versus the ornamental. Previously, the negative perception of excessive technique seems to have existed on both sides, with Jourdan, for instance, using it as the ultimate insult in referring to Italian music as "la Musique savante."¹⁹ With the quarrel's second, post-*Lettre* phase comes a shift, following which the *coin de la reine*'s attacks on French music's reliance on technique seem to have convinced the *coin du roi* it should redirect its attacks to Italian music's excesses. In both cases, the criticized aspects are embraced by those being attacked: as analyzed in the next section, the Italians justify alleged excess as the proof of its music's incomparable force born out of *pathos*, and the French posit technique as an essential component of good music that allows for greater depth.²⁰ Thus, these perceived faults find direct musical correspondences to certain argumentative flaws we examined earlier (French music's reliance on technique pointing to empty argumentation and Italian music's excesses being matched by the *coin de la reine*'s—and particularly Rousseau's—virulent, personal attacks),

¹⁹ Jourdan, *Le Correcteur des bouffons* à l'écolier de Prague, in *QB*, 200.

²⁰ Although this division becomes more systematic in the quarrel's second phase, the *coin du roi*'s defense of technique starts earlier, with thinkers such as Marin already noting the positive aspects of technique in early 1753: "Le récitatif Français est plus travaillé et plus savant. ... Celui des Italiens n'est qu'une déclamation notée," *Ce qu'on Dit, ce qu'on a voulu dire, lettre à Madame Folio, marchande de brochures dans la Place du vieux Louvre*, in *QB*, 478.

allowing music to reveal the pitfalls that must be avoided in seeking to achieve eloquence. Even in pondering its negative aspects, eloquence can therefore learn from music.

This educational component in the elaboration of musical eloquence also exists in the link to a written form. For Rousseau, writing and musical notation are born out of needs that involve an increasingly cosmopolitan society, unlike painting (which remains for Rousseau linked to earlier forms of writing, like hieroglyphics) and dance (which never evolved to this point). This links eloquence (originally oral but now written) to music (still auditory but with a written form that has just reached its apex, following centuries of relative informality) in a unique fashion: by choosing music as the theme of the quarrel, Rousseau points to the state of eloquence and encourages a return to the essence of rhetorical principles, still successfully incarnated by music. The call for music to return to its glorious ancient roots is also a call for a return towards the debates of those times. For Rousseau, neither is an attempt to stop progress but a desire to recover the original, essential aspirations of the two forms, which includes scaling back areas in which culture has gone too far.²¹ Interestingly, the process of developing modern writing began with the Greeks for Rousseau, so taking eloquence and acknowledging its modern written form while trying to restore its original functions is a way of once again paying homage to ancient Greece, just as Rousseau clearly seeks to do with his idealized form of music. To this point, he notes that the Greeks had seven vowels.²² So, while the French have multiplied consonants (a recurring theme in Rousseau's attacks), they have concurrently diminished the

²¹ This position leads to an impasse, as noted a few lines down. As we saw previously, other thinkers, such as D'Alembert and Grimm, take a more conciliatory position in their acceptance of certain French perspectives, rather than presenting the situation as an irreversible decadence derived from social and cultural progress.

²² "Ceux qui ne comptent que cinq voyelles se trompent fort: les Grecs en avaient sept, les premiers Romains six," Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 72.

number of vowels. This is indicative of the *Lettre*'s fundamental dilemma: while the French must aspire to curb their cultural excesses and return to ancient simplicity, it is in fact impossible for them to ever find musical eloquence based on the state of their language. The impossibility of French musical eloquence is due to all the wrong elements (harmony, technique and long-established performance practices) having completely subsumed what allows music to be musical. As a result, if eloquence follows the example of French music, it can only fail.²³ For both *coins* and the *coin de la reine* in particular, based on its ancient precepts, the loss of eloquence would be akin to the disappearance of great music: both must adapt in terms of form and overall conceptualization, so as to survive. For the *coin de la reine*, this results in two possible solutions for French music (the adaptation to the ideal Italian style, which Rousseau sees as impossible because of the French language's deficiencies, or the acceptance of Italian music as France's own), and leads to the evolution of eloquence into a form of written conversation examined at the end of this chapter. The first step towards such adaptations lies in locating what is essential to both eloquence and music.

In pursuit of the essential: removing ornamentation

The search for the core constituent parts of music and eloquence is validated by Rousseau's attack of the over-valuation of ornaments exhibited in French society. This is visible in language, and Rousseau uses the example of written accents to prove his point:²⁴ within his logic of reversal—revealed to the advanced reader throughout his quarrel texts—their

²³ Indeed, the demise of both eloquence and music is felt in the rise of poor taste and of bad genres, as depicted by Grimm in *Le Petit Prophète de Boehmischbroda*, 190.

²⁴ For Rousseau, *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, 229, written accents are not indicative of former melody but, rather, of the disappearance of spoken accents, which is to say of the French language's progressive fragmentation.

proliferation is an indication of the lack of any actual accentuation. The implicit comparison to Italian, which has no written accents but is ideal in its varied oral accentuation, is impossible to miss. At a certain juncture, the more language and rhetoric seek to evolve, the farther away from perfection they head. Just as Lully was the pinnacle (if there was one) of French music, going back to ancient music and eloquence is a return to the disciplines' highest points. Because perfection (or the highest possible level, even if it is very low, as in the case of French music) was already reached, there is a point at which continuing the evolution in fact becomes a reverse movement—a descent or undoing.

This helps justify an alignment with the Ancients for the *coin de la reine*, although we will see that the question of what is central and what is ornamental is of prime importance to debaters from both *coins*. In *De la Liberté de la musique*, D'Alembert reminds his reader that *ingenium* and *inventio* matter far more than *actio* (which is important but secondary). Thus, he describes French listeners charmed by Italian music, indicating that “ils répondaient que si l'exécution était mauvaise, la Musique était divine, et qu'ils préféreraient un excellent livre aussi mal lu qu'on voudrait, à la lecture la mieux faite d'un ouvrage fastidieux.”²⁵ This conception of eloquence and music is based on being able to distinguish between the central and the ornamental, using *delectare* to achieve *memoria* in the quarrel proper. Thus, a fundamental opposition of quality and quantity is established along the lines of D'Alembert's statement concerning “excellent[s] livre[s],” written eloquence learning from music how to achieve strong impact: for him, the only memorable contributions are Rousseau's *Lettre sur la musique*

²⁵ D'Alembert, *De la Liberté de la musique*, in *QB*, 2211.

française and Grimm's *Petit Prophète*—"les deux seules dont on se souviene."²⁶ The two works are seminal and suffice to ensure the *coin de la reine*'s points are understood. However, D'Alembert later takes this argument a step further, showing that not only do the French improperly emphasize *actio*—not merely performance in a modern sense but the incorporation of rhetorical values that form a true musical performance, including the propriety so prized by his opponents, as well as gestures and enunciation—but they also do so poorly and to such an extent that bad execution—which can be overlooked in Italian music due to the latter's innate qualities—ends up augmenting the detrimental effect. He likens French performance techniques to "un écueil insurmontable au débit ou à l'agrément du récitatif" that constitutes "tous ces ornements."²⁷ Even though *actio* is secondary, its role becomes very important because so many grievous errors in it amount to a destruction—or subsuming—of what is central by the ornamental.²⁸ This recurring theme is based on an agreement in the *coin de la reine* that French music does not differentiate between what is essential to music and what is not,²⁹ which leads to its overvaluation of harmony or the characterization that Diderot (among many others) contrasts to what Italian musicians are able to achieve: "Il vit que le musicien savait faire des accompagnements et non du bruit."³⁰

²⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 2246.

²⁸ Similarly, D'Alembert notes that poor *actio* on the part of French musicians leads to contradictions that reveal their lack of comprehension of Italian music: "les morceaux vifs du *Stabat* [de Pergolèse], exécutés gaiement au Concert Spirituel, ont paru des contre-sens à plusieurs de ceux qui les ont entendus," *Ibid.*, 2272.

²⁹ The pride taken by French composers in technique and other characteristics viewed as ancillary by the other side is evident early on, with Jourdan praising the "merveilleux" and "le plaisir de l'illusion que produit un Mécanisme admirable," *Le Correcteur des bouffons*, in *QB*, 204. Although they go towards *delectare* and perhaps even *movere*, these concepts are seen by the *coin de la reine* as violating the more fundamental principles of *ethos* and clarity (or simplicity), while also impeding *docere*.

³⁰ Diderot, *Les Trois Chapitres, ou la vision de la nuit du mardi-gras au mercredi des cendres*, in *QB*, 500.

Part of the establishment of this system depends on an organization not dissimilar to the hierarchy Rousseau initiated concerning the thought process in his theories of authorship. This valuing of *ingenium*, complemented by close reading on the receiving end, allows Rousseau to proceed from a position of strength as he fashions a forceful attack on what he sees as the artificial and unnecessary aspects of French music—what he terms “toute cette mausade parure”³¹ in the opening pages of his *Lettre sur la musique française*. The start of the *Lettre*’s first section on the subtleties of Italian accompaniment includes an indication that the latter should only take place “Si le chant est de nature à exiger quelques additions,”³² which is the reader’s first clue to the significance the notion of “duplicité de mélodie” that appears at the end of the same paragraph. Not only does the statement encourage us to ferret out double meanings—with “duplicité” itself playing on its two meanings (“double” and “traître”)—, it also justifies any elements that might seemingly contradict Rousseau’s main theory of “unité de mélodie” by providing an argument that is clearly positioned even higher in the hierarchy of the author’s reasoning, in the moral sphere: above all else, music must be natural. Having planted this idea, Rousseau can now paint French musical characteristics as going against everything natural in hopes the reader will share his outrage or at the very least understand and sympathize with his line of argumentation:

Une autre chose qui n’est pas moins contraire que la multiplication des parties à la règle que je viens d’établir, c’est l’abus ou plutôt l’usage des fugues, imitations, doubles dessins et autres beautés arbitraires et de pure conviction, qui n’ont presque de mérite que la difficulté vaincue, et qui toutes ont été inventées dans la naissance de l’art pour faire briller le

³¹ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 144.

³² *Ibid.*, 160.

savoir, en attendant qu'il fût question du génie. Je ne dis pas qu'il soit impossible de conserver l'auditeur d'une partie à l'autre à mesure que le sujet y passe; mais ce travail est si pénible que presque personne n'y réussit, et si ingrat qu'à peine le succès peut-il dédommager de la fatigue d'un tel ouvrage.³³

The passage contains clear political implications, with the use of terms such as “abus,” “beautés arbitraires,” and “faire briller le savoir,” all of which go towards the monarchy’s brilliance, inherited from the previous century just as Rameau’s forms directly succeed Lully’s. Thus, French music’s poor state implicitly reveals a similar occurrence in the political realm—contributing to the notion of a hidden subtext, developed further in this chapter. However, the idea that these attributes were created due to a lack of actual *ingenium* (“en attendant qu’il fût question du génie”) is an attack on music as the representation of both the crown and of fundamental deficiencies in argumentation. The text is therefore equally rich within a reading of the *Lettre* as a defense of eloquence as it is in an examination of socio-political undercurrents. In fact, the latter support the former in that it is precisely through eloquent discourse—transferred to the written form, as we have seen—that the public can be rallied and persuaded to take action (or not). Rousseau is evidently inspired by Yves Marie André,³⁴ whose classification of the arts’ constitutive parts into three main categories: three orders (“un ordre essentiel, un ordre naturel, un ordre civil”) give way to three types of beauty (“un Beau essentiel, un Beau naturel, un Beau

³³ *Ibid.*, 161.

³⁴ Yves Marie André is known for his popular *Traité sur le beau*, written in 1741 and published posthumously on six occasions. It undergoes a scathing review in Fétis’ *Biographie universelle des musiciens*, v. 1, 97, for both its traditional depiction of musical beauty’s foundation in mimesis and for what the reviewer sees as an erroneous application of Rameau’s *corps sonores* principle.

artificiel ou arbitraire”)³⁵ in a system that is overtly drawn from rhetorical models. Rousseau forms a sort of amalgamation of the Père André’s artificial and essential beauties into one grouping that encompasses any aspect that might challenge melody’s effectiveness—everything that is therefore inessential to music’s primordial link to nature.³⁶ As is the case in André’s classifications, Rousseau attempts to differentiate between elements that are crucial to the main argument (in this case, melody) and those that are not. At the beginning of his letter, Rousseau affirmed his alignment with the Ancients’ methods, including those aspects of rhetorical discourse that support the main argument, and even explained how certain of these could be put to good use. In contrast, this section advocates completely purging music of any such secondary aspects. This hard line and the violence of Rousseau’s attack are certainly a continuation of the author’s fight against the combination of errors that results in “duplicité de mélodie,” but his argumentation goes beyond this: as they exist in French music, these elements are the exact inverse of Rousseau’s depiction of all that is “natural” in Italian music. Whereas in Italian music duplication was in some fashion naturally called for and managed to respect the “unité de mélodie” that served as its guiding force (following Rousseau’s theoretically-sound argumentation pattern, even if it is sometimes based on incorrect or unverifiable foundations), the French form of multiplication is purely and *intentionally* artificial for Rousseau.

³⁵ André, *Essai sur le beau: ou l’on examine précisément le beau dans le physique, dans le moral, dans les ouvrages d’esprit, et dans la musique*, 61.

³⁶ The inclusion of “le beau essentiel” in this grouping of components that detract from music’s elemental position for Rousseau (i.e. its natural aspect) may seem counterintuitive. In fact, by “essentiel,” André means the qualities that are fundamental to musical systems and rules (as is explicitly confirmed when he transfers his general aesthetic theories specifically to music) and thus mirrors Rousseau’s views concerning the role of harmony. Taking into account this narrow definition, Rousseau’s rejection is logical, and the one important category that he retains as essential—natural beauty—is in fact described by André in *Essai sur le beau*, 62, as “un beau de goût, fondé sur un sentiment éclairé du beau naturel,” coinciding well with the *philosophes*’ precepts.

Therefore, Rousseau goes well beyond criticizing the abuse of such characteristics and draws attention to the fact that their use is vicious: “c’est **l’abus ou plutôt l’usage** des fugues...”³⁷ This is because the techniques are “arbitraire[s],” meaning not required by nature (and reminding us once again of André’s classifications)—the result of years of poor convictions and conventions that have resulted in bad taste. However, what most bothers Rousseau and motivates the virulence of his attack is the idea of intentional difficulty. This aversion may stem from the rise of “difficulté vaincue” in descriptive poetry of the eighteenth century but it is transferred from the author to the public, operating something a reversal of this very principle’s aims:³⁸ the *coin de la reine*’s objections to the deliberate difficulty of French music is indeed based on the flaunting of unnecessarily complicated forms but the latter are not conquered. Rather, they are used out of context and ineffectively, creating confusion instead of aiding the listener’s understanding. The French composers’ desire to be complicated reveals a breach of *decorum*: such use of technique may be believed to achieve *delectare* for the French listener but this is an illusion that results from having abandoned the listener’s education in favor of displaying the composer’s, while on a stylistic level the error lies in a failure to express music’s

³⁷ This notion of intentional abuse of techniques is also seen in Rousseau’s *Lettre d’un symphoniste de l’académie royale de musique, à ses camarades de l’orchestre*, in *QB*, 648: “ces ignorants Italiens qui ne savent rien, et qui font, on ne sait comment, de la Musique ravissante que nous avons quelquefois beaucoup de peine à défigurer.” Clearly, technique and the pursuit of pseudo-science (through claimed “savoir”) are overrated, while natural *ingenium* and a valuing what is central (made up of the “on ne sait comment”) result in good music.

³⁸ In *The Unfinished Enlightenment: Description in the Age of the Encyclopedia*, 131, Joanna Stalnaker mentions Delille’s taste for this technique, noting that he believed that “poetic language can transform our perceptions of the world.” This observation is indicative of the poet’s responsibility to take these difficulties, conquer them and distill them into something from which his reader can then learn. (Similarly, aesthetic treatises sometimes remark that the artist or sculptor has shown his mastery of “difficulté vaincue” when he has been able to take something confused, such as a misshapen stone, and turned it into a clear and precise work of art. See, for instance, the entry on “jaspe” quartz in Aubin Louis Millin’s *Dictionnaire des beaux-arts*, v. 2, 122.) Of course, this often results in a display of difficulty through versification, but there is nevertheless a sense that the difficulty lies with the poet, more than the reader. Fabienne Moore interestingly points out that it is Rousseau who transfers the idea of conquered difficulty from poetry to prose, describing his own *Confessions* as having “le mérite de la difficulté vaincue” (*Prose Poems of the French Enlightenment: Delimiting Genre*, 163).

content, focusing instead on personal aspirations that overshadow music's essence—in effect, *verba* subsumes *res*. French music is convoluted as a whole, whereas Italian music is conceptually simple—so as to please the most basic level of listeners—but hides an inner complexity intended for those who have the capacity to hear it. The French approach exposes a complete incomprehension of what is essential, based on a misconception of what constitutes both *ingenium* and *inventio*. Instead of taking a concept and giving it what it needs to evolve, French music values all that is bad and makes it worse. The problem is fundamentally due to poor rhetorical training, as Holbach explains. For him, the value of eloquence is immense, especially in its use to form young minds. Rhetoric is increasingly poorly taught, which is why it is dying and misunderstood: in his critique of the zealous efforts of the young man from the *coin du roi*, Holbach indicates that one should “réprimander le Professeur sous lequel le jeune homme a fait sa Rhétorique, du peu de liaison, d'ordre et de justesse qui règne dans ses idées.”³⁹ The importance of properly mastering and valuing the essence of eloquence is plain, and the author emphasizes the point by going on to criticize the young man's excessive use of metaphors.

On the one hand, this opposition of central and ornamental links eloquence to music: its mirroring of the *coin de la reine*'s attacks on French music's abuse of techniques again draws attention to the *querelle*'s mapping on previous rhetorical debates. The quarrel of Asianism versus Atticism is once more useful, if only because each side places a different value on what is central (achieving a strong impact or valuing national traditions) in a fashion that reflects this heritage. However, the link finds its greatest strength in the *coin de la reine*'s definition of music, which gains an advantage from this mapping: the duality of Asianism against Atticism is

³⁹ Holbach, *Arrêt rendu à l'amphithéâtre de l'opéra, sur la plainte du milieu du parterre intervenant dans la querelle des deux coins*, in *QB*, 284.

vividly replicated in the *coin*'s idea that the essential principles of eloquence are what is central to music, while the techniques (of composition or performance) and embellishments abused by its opponents are ornaments (quite literally, in some instances). On the other hand, the high dose of *pathos* used by the partisans of Italian music is necessary from a practical standpoint: not only does it achieve the aim of persuasion, but it also is the element most responsible for music's essential, special force. In addition to this internal form of *decorum* (the strength of the Italian style matching music's essence), Italian music's force provides the *coin de la reine* with the motivation it needs to produce the forceful attacks that are responsible for the *querelle*'s very existence. To this point, D'Alembert depicts the quarrel as having awakened the public, a necessary endeavor because the latter is comprised of "Parisiens oisifs."⁴⁰

For Rousseau, finding what is essential can be achieved through a sort of algebraically-inspired notion of stripping the dispensable. His desire to simplify musical notation is similar to his efforts to reform language and return to eloquence its essential aspects: his *Projet concernant de nouveaux signes pour la musique* presented in 1742 (the year he went to Venice and discovered Italian music) to the Académie des Sciences de Dijon, and his *Dissertation sur la musique moderne*, published the following year and developing the same themes, propose a new type of musical notation that uses numbers instead of traditional musical symbols (supplemented by certain shorthand practices, such as dots above and below the numbers respectively indicating a higher or lower octave). Rousseau contended that this would aid the composer, the musician and the learner of music by simplifying traditional notation and bringing it closer to its natural

⁴⁰ The remark applies to the post-quarrel context (*De la Liberté de la musique*, in *QB*, 2216), indicating just how much Parisians needed stimulation, and meshes nicely with Rousseau's declaration in the *Confessions* (as previously cited) that the quarrel prevented a revolution—at least temporarily.

mathematical state. In an effort to promote education and to value the essential over the ornamental, there is clearly an effort to remove useless techniques and flourishes, while protecting key parts, restoring a correspondence between content and form.⁴¹ On a conceptual rather than applied level, the link to language is similarly crucial to music's authenticity: Rousseau indicates that when music dictates its own construction, rather than obeying linguistic and textual precepts, this results in abusive and destructive use of unnatural techniques ("les fredons, les cadences, les ports-de-voix").⁴² In response, the use of technique is defended by the *coin du roi* as specifically what links French music to nature, not only as it relates to practice but also—and perhaps more important—in the act of composition. Thus, Jourdan writes that "elle [la nature] donne aussi à quelqu'un qui a tant soit peu l'oreille organisée, la faculté de faire sur le champ une Basse à un Air qu'il entend par la rencontre de la tierce et de la quinte qui forment l'accord parfait, ce qui prouve que la Musique est presque innée chez nous..."⁴³ For the French side, the universality of Rameau's theories proves their basis in nature, while the Italianists view the resulting facility of composition and its extension into performance practices as a too-great reliance on technique.

Consequently, through a linguistic division in both inception and execution, the *coin de la reine* contends that the French recitative loses any bond it may have had with eloquent declamation. The resulting effect is most visible in the French recitative: "Qu'on me montre au

⁴¹ For Jacqueline Waeber, Rousseau's notation is intended for the well-trained musician who "still feels uncomfortable when required to sight-read the score"—a reflection of Rousseau himself—allowing the whole work to be perceived at a glance ("Jean-Jacques Rousseau's 'unité de mélodie,'" 130). This is certainly a part of Rousseau's ambition but his proposal also seeks to be more encompassing, serving multiple levels of participants in music's elaboration and performance, helping music reclaim its essence, and reinstating *decorum* between music's aims and its written execution. Striving for the latter gives Rousseau's notation a way of rivaling the ease of composition that Rameau has achieved, but without the use of artificial techniques.

⁴² Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 175.

⁴³ Jourdan, *Le Correcteur des bouffons*, in *QB*, 209.

moins quelque côté par lequel on puisse raisonnablement vanter ce merveilleux recitatif français dont l'invention fait la gloire de Lully,"⁴⁴ writes Rousseau. The author diminishes the current representative of French music by implying Rameau's recitative is simply a worsened version inherited from Lully who had at least created something unique. Similarly, the use of the word "merveilleux" is striking in its opposition to "raisonnablement:" the former is used both sardonically and very seriously, as one cannot reasonably justify something that is from the domain of the "merveilleux," calling to mind on the fundamental differences between the French and Italian styles. Indeed, the very core of *tragédie lyrique* is being impugned. Along with this flawed *inventio*, one of the recurring themes of Rousseau's analysis lies in his criticism of the eccentricities of French musical practices, such as excessive use of trills and cadences. Profound irony can be felt as he indicates the "bel effet"⁴⁵ of these techniques, which bear no resemblance to what is being conveyed and contribute to the noise-like quality of French music that underline this breach of *decorum* by completely obscuring the music's ability to flow like good declamation.

D'Alembert makes a similar case by quoting Pascal's critique of empty rhetoric: "*Voilà, comme disait Pascal de je ne sais quel raisonnement d'Escobar, ce qui s'appelle argumenter en forme; ce n'est pas là discourir, c'est prouver.*"⁴⁶ By referencing Pascal's critique in the *Lettres Provinciales* of sixteenth century theologian Antonia Escobar y Mendoza's *Summula casuum conscientiae* and applying it to the previous statement, which culminated with the recommendation "Conservons donc l'Opéra tel qu'il est, si nous avons envie de conserver le

⁴⁴ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 175.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 181.

⁴⁶ D'Alembert, *De la Liberté de la musique*, in *QB*, 2217.

Royaume,”⁴⁷ D’Alembert imbues himself with Pascal’s authority, while pointing to a lack of morality in musical censorship that corresponds to a similar lack in empty rhetoric. Sometimes misinterpreted as indicative of D’Alembert’s own views, the citation to which Pascal’s recommendation is applied is in fact attributed by D’Alembert to “nos grands Politiques,” harshly criticized for refusing to adapt their music due to political motivations and thus revealing music’s hidden socio-political implications. The Pascal quote brings to light a simultaneously ridiculous and immoral use of eloquence—in its ability to prove anything through the use of technique and its complete disregard for *ethos*—, linking it to French music’s similar flaws. Bad use of rhetoric comes from the French side because, as in its music, it relies on tired techniques, rather than the core values of eloquence. So, while Rousseau claims that overuse of technique yields poor music and poor arguments, D’Alembert demonstrates that these results can be even more dangerous: they bear the appearance of something worthwhile, even though their true guiding ideas are poor or nonexistent—a sort of rhetorical mirroring of Rousseau’s “duplicité de mélodie,” with the relation of “duplicité” to a want of *ethos* fully underscored by Pascal’s own attack of Escobar having been founded on moral grounds.

If he depicts in *De la Liberté de la musique* ornaments of all types in French music as unnecessary additions, good technique can in fact be a solution for D’Alembert. The author notes that adding cadences and *ports de voix* to Italian recitative, while making it less rapid, would result in “du chant ordinaire.”⁴⁸ So, the French and Italian styles are not that far apart, once the ornamental aspects (here, of performance) are removed. French recitative is much like the Italian, with the addition of unnecessary elements: “je m’aperçus qu’en chantant ce récitatif

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 2248.

avec lenteur et les prétendus agréments du nôtre, il devenait un recitativo Français...”⁴⁹ This leads D’Alembert to experiment with the reverse notion, removing all the bad habits of the French performance style in his performance of a French recitative. He finds this “récitatif débité à l’Italienne”⁵⁰ a real pleasure, devoid of the disgust experienced in its standard form. With the *bouffons* about to depart and the quarrel in its last leg as D’Alembert pens his text,⁵¹ some sort of compromise begins to be conceivable. However, for it to work, the composer must already be following natural declamation in the Italian style (since, in moments where he does not, the “récitatif Français *italianisé*”⁵² is horrible), meaning that the solution is not as simple as it may seem, if it is one at all. Regardless of this, superfluous ornamentation is seen as not only detrimental but as obscuring what truly matters, going so far as to render ordinary what should be eloquent. In his *Réflexions sur la musique*, D’Alembert further explains the extent to which French music has come to rely on technique by proposing a hypothetical experiment in which French music sung from behind a curtain would be “une suite de sons harmonieux, fort agréables pour elle, peut-être même capables de faire naître quelque sentiment dans son cœur, mais qui ne réveilleraient aucune idée dans son esprit.”⁵³ This major deficiency (rendered all the more crucial by the French side’s pride in the intellectual component of its music) is due to French music having come to rely on *actio* to the point that this is the main—if not the only—aspect that stimulates the audience. Indeed, as we saw in Chapter 1, the French vision of *actio* as an

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

⁵¹ Exact dating information for *De la Liberté de la musique* is unavailable, though Denise Launay places it towards the very end of the quarrel thanks to the references it contains.

⁵² *Ibid.*

⁵³ D’Alembert, *Réflexions sur la musique*, in *QB*, 1664.

elaborate enactment of what is being conveyed through performance, which relies greatly on *elocutio* or a high level of skill on the part of its singers (and to a lesser extent its other musicians), is what allows French recitatives and airs to pass for great pieces of music. In reality the embellishments brought by (and expected of) French performers masks the music's deficiencies: a secondary function has replaced what the primary component—music itself—should accomplish. If the two thinkers' reasoning is somewhat different, D'Alembert therefore agrees with Rousseau that the excessive emphasis on technique in French music results in a loss of the essential through a valuation of the ornamental.

The *coin du roi* agrees that seeking out the central is necessary—often without much explanation beyond accusing its opponents of lacking this ability, such as in Rameau's statement concerning Rousseau that “La Critique ne roule plus que sur une Parenthèse qui ne vaut pas la peine qu'on s'y arrête,”⁵⁴ which is intended to reveal Rousseau's erroneous focus on the inessential—but disagrees on what defines it. This is glaringly obvious in the complete seriousness with which Travenol praises Rameau for mimicking frog sounds in *Platée*, which he sums up as “cette excellente Musique, qui nous rend si merveilleusement le croassement des Grenouilles.”⁵⁵ The translation of frog sounds is a musical element that, while it would certainly qualify as one of those elements described by the other side as contributing to the noisy quality of French opera, is considered proof of the genre's closeness to nature for the *coin du roi*. Indeed, the use of the adjective “merveilleusement” is a judgment call that indicates just how perfectly the frog sounds are replicated, with a sense that this strongly contributes to music's

⁵⁴ Rameau, *Observations sur notre instinct pour la musique et sur son principe*: où les moyens de reconnaître l'un par l'autre, conduisent à pouvoir se rendre raison avec certitude des différents effets de cet art, in *QB*, 1874.

⁵⁵ Travenol, *La Galerie de l'académie royale de musique*, in *QB*, 1496.

primary role of *delectare*, while also indicating a sense of awe. The latter is associated with the sublime, which is associated with the style of grand *tragédies lyriques*, as we saw earlier, and seems to counter the other side's claimed disadvantage in supporting *opere buffe*. Even in the comic style, Rameau manages to be sublime. However, the qualification can also be thought of in more classical terms: even though the notion of “merveilleux” is not used to mean “magical” in this context, its appearance is nevertheless a nod to *Platée* fulfilling this essential principle of French opera, for it is only within the realm of the *merveilleux* that an opera—even of the comic genre—could feature a hideous water nymph (played by a male counter-tenor) in the starring role, backed by a chorus of singing frogs. Although Travenol's statement may very well seem bizarre, if it is perceived as such, this is proof that the reader is not truly French. Travenol thus reminds his reader that French music must above all seek to please its own audience, in contrast with the more universal and unfocused ambitions of its Italian counterpart.

If simplicity and believability are important for Italian music, French opera has its own set of favored qualities, and it views Italian simplicity as proof of its status as a mere “divertissement,”⁵⁶ defining it as firmly in the second part of the central versus ornamental duality. In fact, the other side does not understand what is to blame for the aspects of French music it finds lacking, tying into fundamental flaws in its reasoning: “Il fallait donc réserver à d'autres cette critique, qui toute judicieuse qu'elle est, paraît ici fort déplacée,”⁵⁷ writes Laugier. According to him, Rousseau attacks the wrong part of the author-composer relationship: music

⁵⁶ Rochemont, *Réflexions d'un patriote sur l'opéra français et sur l'opéra italien, qui présentent le parallèle du goût des deux nations dans les beaux arts*, in *QB*, 2038. Worse than mere ornament, the style of Italian music imported into France is considered as a side show even in Italy where, according to Rochemont, it serves as a supplement to other forms and is only performed during carnivals (*Ibid.*, 2041).

⁵⁷ Laugier, *Apologie de la musique française contre M. Rousseau*, in *QB*, 1210.

itself is not to blame for a lack of good inspiration and the faults Rousseau finds are in fact due to the libretto. Laugier concludes that Rousseau is in fact attacking the poet, rather than the composer, without realizing this. The *coin de la reine* thus displays poor use of *judicium* in its argumentative “contre-sens” that reflect the defects of its music. For Chastellux, conceding to Italian music certain abilities allows French music’s core values to be emphasized: he acknowledges with sincerity the great advantage of Italian recitative by stating “Que mes compatriotes me le pardonnent ou non, je trouve le Récitatif Italien plus naturel que le nôtre: on y remarque les mêmes inflexions de voix que dans la conversation ordinaire...”⁵⁸ Good music is all about balance according to this author who stresses this central component of French *decorum*. Although his open-ended statement allows for multiple readings, the notion of “ordinaire” seems key here. Just as Rameau managed to maintain the sublime even in *Platée*, recitative should not be “ordinaire,” since it is part of an opera and therefore a world that is above the plain style. If D’Alembert marveled at the way Italian recitative was like a real conversation, Chastellux takes the idea of “vrai” and transforms it into “ordinaire,” rendering it inappropriate for or unworthy of real opera.

Another unsurprisingly frequent part of the *coin du roi*’s definition of what is central has to do with Rameau, whose theories position harmony as more fundamental than melody. Numerous partisans of French music rally around this idea. For instance, Castel uses it to establish a distinction between what is superficial and exterior (movement, “musique Italienne”), and what is profound and interior (French dance, and simply “musique”). Although he does not

⁵⁸ Chastellux, *Nouvelle lettre à M. Rousseau de Genève. Sur celle qui parut de lui, il y a quelques mois, contre la musique française*, in *QB*, 1481.

explain precisely how this works, he writes about “La bagatelle du chant,”⁵⁹ creating a clear opposition of frivolous (outward) melodies to the more serious and deep (inward) nature of harmony. Caux de Cappeval expounds on this by describing Italian recitative as a “Récitatif sans âme,”⁶⁰ meaning it lacks its most essential (and inward) qualities—such as harmony. This reflection on music has consequences for the quarrel’s very structure: in thinking about the latter, it is all about outward exchanges, yet it must be governed by an inner morality that is perceived as the key to persuading. Therefore, both eloquence (as embodied in the texts of the *querelle*) and music must learn to foster these more inward qualities, while using their outer shells to appeal and draw in the reader or listener. From this perspective, the previously-mentioned idea that Italian music is a passing fad can be better understood:⁶¹ the reader or listener may be temporarily seduced by outward beauty but will eventually seek more, and it is at that moment that French music will triumph. Thus, Caux de Cappeval notes that in the Italian style “le Récitatif se fait en courant.”⁶² This indicates a lack of *decorum*—the moment acknowledged by the Italianists as the most important being passed over, rather than savored and developed—but and of persuasiveness, since the importance of recitatives (which are equivalent to the most crucial passages of a discourse) requires taking time to reflect and provide depth. The French

⁵⁹ Castel, *Réponse critique d’un académicien de Rouen, à l’académicien de Bordeaux, sur le plus profond de la musique*, in *QB*, 1453.

⁶⁰ Caux de Cappeval, *Apologie du goût français, relativement à l’opéra*, in *QB*, 1566.

⁶¹ In his *Lettre critique et historique sur la musique française, la musique italienne, et sur les bouffons à Madame D...*, in *QB*, 466, Jourdan goes so far as to blame the insatiable French appetite for fads—from furniture to clothing—for the support of Italian music. He implies that, like the other fads, Italian music will eventually lose its luster, and what is central will regain its rightful position. Interestingly, the idea of *ornatus* explored further on and constituted of similar elements is central to the *coin du roi*. (See, for example, footnotes 68 and 114.)

⁶² Caux de Cappeval, *Apologie du goût français, relativement à l’opéra*, in *QB*, 1566.

slowness⁶³ so reproached is like a long but reasoned discourse, perhaps even a bit boring, but full of substance, while the Italians merrily skip through even the most poignant moments.

This parallel of inner versus outer to central versus ornamental is further developed when Castel declares that “La mélodie n’est donc qu’une harmonie successive,”⁶⁴ which is a way of viewing the inner parts of what is hidden in harmony as externalized by melody. Of course, harmony could conversely be said to be nothing more than a melody grouped together (though no one seems to adopt this retort), but the position of harmony as moral and melody as more aligned with the secondary aspects of eloquence signals that the *coin du roi* is well aware of melody’s preeminence among the guiding principles of Rousseau’s theories. As such, Castel uses humor to demonstrate that it is in fact French music—in its appreciation of the foundations offered by harmony, rather than the Italian genre’s reliance on melody—that values simplicity of structure: “Il est admirable aussi que vous alliez jusqu’à nous donner une façon toute simple de traduire en Musique de l’Italien en Français, et du Français en Italien ... Par exemple, *ut re mi* Français se traduit en *ut mi sol si re fa mi ut sol*.”⁶⁵ Rousseau is thus presented as contradicting his own claims of Italian simplicity. In a portrayal that almost seems to forecast the future of Italian opera and the jokes concerning its tendency to make verbose use of notes, Italian music as depicted by Castel may have simple harmony but its melody is overcharged, lacking the moral honesty and simplicity of the French style. He further reminds us of music and eloquence’s

⁶³ Slowness is defended by *coin du roi*, often through attacks of Italian music’s fast *tempi*. For instance, Jourdan describes Italian opera as “assommée de 40 ou 50 ariettes qui ne vous donnent pas le temps de respirer et qui sont presque toujours les mêmes,” Jourdan, *Seconde Lettre du correcteur des bouffons à l’écolier de Prague, contenant quelques observations sur l’opéra de Titon, le Jaloux corrigé, et le Devin du village*, in *QB*, 570. Beyond the correlation between speediness and reduced quality, the reflective quality afforded to French music by its slowness appears to contribute to fulfilling the need for variation recognized by both sides.

⁶⁴ Caux de Cappeval, *Apologie du goût français, relativement à l’opéra*, in *QB*, 1460.

⁶⁵ Castel, *Réponse critique d’un académicien de Rouen*, in *QB*, 1466.

shared goals by reducing the forms to their most basic aim of persuasion in his depiction of French music's unique "suavité," directly inherited from the rhetorical concept of *suavitas*: "Qu'ils en soient la force, nous en sommes au moins la suavité: elle peut convaincre, nous persuadons."⁶⁶ In this rapport, to persuade is a level above convincing in that it involves fully affecting the reader and subtly causing him to change his mind, rather than merely impressing him with a forceful effect that may only prove temporary. *Suavitas* conjures up the French notion of *bon goût* and the primary position of *delectare*, but it also has two main other rhetorically-based links that support Castel's claim of greater persuasion: first, *suavitas* is a key part of Cicero's notion of ornateness (along with *gravitas* and *dignitas*)⁶⁷—achieving *varietas*, while also showing the ancient idea of ornament can in fact be crucial (even if it is not conceived in opposition to the central in this context) through its use of elements such as metaphors in language and justifying the techniques and use of ornamentation critiqued by Rousseau in music because they impede clarity—⁶⁸ and, second, it does indeed have a special bond with persuasion in its etymological kinship, *suavitas* being linked to *suadere* (to persuade). So, for Castel, the proof of French music's success is based on a demonstration of what is *most* central among the essential components of eloquence. With persuasion the agreed-upon primary goal of music and

⁶⁶ Castel, *Lettres d'un académicien de Bordeaux sur le fonds de la musique*, in *QB*, 1389.

⁶⁷ Cicero, *Rheotirca ad Herennium*, Book IV. Also see Mary Carruthers' explanation of these concepts as they apply to medieval texts in "*Varietas*: a Word of many Colours," 35.

⁶⁸ See Quintilian on style in *Insitituo Oratoria*, Book VIII, Chapters 2 and 3. The opposition of *ornatus* (ornament) and *perspicuitas* (clarity) is an ancient one, the same words and techniques that amplify the one disparaging the other. So, the defense of the former as central by the *coin du roi* is an appropriate response to the constant advocating of the latter by its adversaries. One can begin to see here just how important ancient principles are on both sides of the debate.

all the forms of ornamentation essential to achieving this aim,⁶⁹ including “suavité,” on the side of French music, he certainly makes a strong point, all the while confirming that eloquence is the most useful gauge of good music.

Indeed, if rhetoric learns from music, the reverse relationship—through its arbitration of what is central—leads to eloquence being music’s judge. This helps explain why excessive force in music is unacceptable for the *coin du roi*, which sees it as amoral—perhaps achieving *varietas* but going against *gravitas* and *dignitas*, the two of which combine with *suavitas* to achieve not only *ornatus* but the *genus grande* (high style) associated with *tragédie lyrique*—rather than an expression of rhetorical violence. So, although *pathos* is important for the *coin du roi*⁷⁰ and it acknowledges music’s ability to excel in this area, its thinkers also engender a division between eloquence and music: the latter must not be overly violent, in keeping with its primary mission to please while remaining true to its form. Chastellux therefore calls for concision,⁷¹ which is a way of indicating that in both music and argumentation, the other side is excessive. As Castel puts it, “en leur donnant tout indistinctement pour nous tout ôter, ne leur donne rien...”⁷² There is a sense that too much praise is like too much liberty in music—a notion Castel sums up by referring to Italian music as “libre, et presque libertine”⁷³, in a pejorative fashion that may have been one of the inspirations for D’Alembert’s defense of this notion in *De la Liberté de la*

⁶⁹ Volker Kapp sees Malebranche, in his support of French Atticism, as also believing ornaments to be indispensable because they lead to virtuous action. (“Apogée de l’atticisme français, ou l’éloquence qui se moque de la rhétorique,” 708-709.) It is therefore no coincidence that thinkers from the *coin du roi*, whom we saw as being influenced by Atticism themselves, should make a similar argument.

⁷⁰ Certain thinkers recognize the preeminence of *pathos* for Italian music and even see it as the form’s source of power. Thus, Rochemont states that “La Musique ne fait une impression si agréable, que parce qu’elle reveille l’image des passions,” *Réflexions d’un patriote sur l’opéra français et sur l’opéra italien*, in *QB*, 2063.

⁷¹ Chastellux, *Nouvelle lettre à M. Rousseau de Genève*, in *QB*, 1481.

⁷² Castel, *Lettres d’un académicien de Bordeaux sur le fonds de la musique*, in *QB*, 1421.

⁷³ *Ibid.*

Musique—, leading to a form of excess that negates itself and consequently results in nothingness. Neither eloquence nor music should be “supérieur aux règles,”⁷⁴ emphasizing the central position of *ethos* and *decorum* for the French side: allowing music to indulge in the Italian sort of excess creates an indecorous rupture with its intended purpose and primary function of *delectare*, and its association with “libertinage” and breaking of rules is immoral for a genre that the French side views as primarily noble. Indeed, Caux de Cappeval presents his definition of true eloquence in this light, as it is incarnated by real thinkers and in opposition to the mere shadows—or imposters—that are Rousseau and the *philosophes*: “Caton ne chassa de Rome que les Philosophes, c’est à dire, les Sophistes et les Discoureurs: espèce d’hommes bien différente des vrais Sages. Ceux-ci possèdent la perfection du Cœur et de l’esprit; les autres n’en ont que l’ombre et l’apparence.”⁷⁵ Clearly, the *philosophes* erroneously and arrogantly think of themselves as “sages”—those whom Plato defined as wise, in opposition to philosophers who seek wisdom.⁷⁶ Therefore, for Caux de Cappeval, *actio* in a generalized sense (the way in which the *philosophes* act as though they are wise) can be misleading and lead to *duplicité* on the part of those who used this term. In this depiction, the sense that rhetoric can be employed as a tool to convince based on lies can be felt, and the notion of *ethos* is returned to its central position.

This goes hand in hand with the value of rules and technique in the moderation so cherished by the *coin du roi* or, as Castel puts it, “Notre propre caractère plus doux, plus modéré,

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 1422.

⁷⁵ Caux de Cappeval, *Apologie du goût français, relativement à l’opéra*, in *QB*, 1552.

⁷⁶ See Plato, *Symposium* and, in particular, the central exchange between Socrates and Diotima of Mantinea (555-559), a wise woman who, when asked to explain love, defines love of wisdom (and truth) as belonging to the philosopher. For Plato, this is perhaps the highest form of love, though Caux de Cappeval uses it here to point out (as Plato’s Diotima did before him) that it only applies to those who have not attained wisdom. (In fact, this is one of the most central points of the *Symposium*, for humanity is defined as fundamentally based on a lack, on seeking something, which is why the gods cannot be philosophers.)

plus timoré, plus sage, plus régulier, plus soutenu, plus terre à terre, en un mot plus vif qu'ardent, plus mobile qu'impétueux, nous tient dans un genre de médiocrité, de cette médiocrité toute d'or, qui fait après tout, la vraie, bonne et belle Musique de commerce et de tous les jours.”⁷⁷ There is a clear pride in the French way of reasoning that is represented by French opera. Only its unique approach could find “gold” in mediocrity, evoking a form of French classicism in which originality is hidden, and measure—positive mediocrity, the middle of the road—is valued over liberty that is immoral in its excess. Jourdan formulates the same idea, going against Rameau to support the theory that music derives its power from its textual inspiration—though not in a purely linguistic sense, as Rousseau would contend, but in the French ideal of eloquence through measure: “Si la déclamation simple peut faire cet effet, une déclamation plus modulée, jointe à des vers aussi tendres et aussi charmants que ceux de Quinault, me fera un plaisir encore plus grand, et par ce côté la Musique de Lully sera toujours sure de remuer les cœurs, malgré la faiblesse des sons qui affecteront l'oreille.”⁷⁸ There is clearly a pleasure in moderation unique to the French people: whereas others may embrace extreme sentiments, for thinkers such as Jourdan, the French public will derive greater satisfaction in the exercise of restraint. Not dissimilarly, Chastellux chastises Rousseau for his sweeping statements, noting that “vous faites une application trop générale.”⁷⁹ Rousseau's contentions are based on his own notion of simplicity and do not work for music rich in harmony. Thus, for Fréron, in *Les Indes Galantes* Rameau gives full force to the orchestra during Emilie's recitative because the tempest—which, far from being ancillary, actually inspires the said recitative—is what really matters. An Italian

⁷⁷ Castel, *Lettres d'un académicien de Bordeaux sur le fonds de la musique*, in *QB*, 1431.

⁷⁸ Jourdan, *Lettre critique et historique sur la musique française*, in *QB*, 453.

⁷⁹ Chastellux, *Nouvelle lettre à M. Rousseau de Genève*, in *QB*, 1484.

musician would have made the melody stand out “et alors il aurait blessé le sens commun, ou en donnant aux paroles l’expression de la tempête, (ce qui serait un contresens) ou en faisant suivre à l’Orchestre le système d’expressions des paroles, ce qui en serait un autre, puisque la symphonie doit continuer à peindre la tempête.”⁸⁰ Although the quest on both sides is the same—to value what is central and achieve persuasion—one can sense music dictating its own order in the *coin du roi*, a reflection of Rameau’s theories, but in a fashion that respects language and authorial intent by using harmony as its foundational element. Beyond its inability to grasp this French specificity based in harmony, Rousseau’s thought process reflects a lack of precision—as does Italian music in its appeal to all of Europe—that is incompatible with French thought.

Thus, both *coins* call for a return to the essence and a removal of the extraneous. The *coin de la reine* proposes to retain its relevance by moving away from practices of abundant ornamentation and by focusing on what is central, instead of abusing technique and developing complexity for the sake of a modernity that has both gone too far (as in Rameau’s musical theories) and reached a point of stagnation (as in French music’s uniform tediousness). D’Alembert’s use of architectural metaphors once again sum up nicely this question of focusing on what is central. He ends his *De la Liberté de la musique* with the story of two architects in Athens who compete to build a monument, one speaking at length and eloquently, and the other simply saying “*ce qu’il a dit, je le ferai*.”⁸¹ The second architect is the more eloquent of the two, for he attains *illustris oratio* or clarity through action and concision. Based on this ancient

⁸⁰ Fréron or Ozy, *Suite des lettres sur la musique française. En réponse à celle de Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, in *QB*, 1034.

⁸¹ D’Alembert, *De la Liberté de la musique*, in *QB*, 2282. This oft cited anecdote is reused by Rousseau in Part IV, Letter II of *Julie ou la Nouvelle Héloïse* (302) as an illustration of eloquence, as well as by such authors as Laclos (in *Laisons Dangereuses*).

rhetorical *topos*, unnecessary embellishments only serve one's opponents, and the recurring theme of architecture calls for a form of active building that ties into the search for what is central. The *coin du roi* similarly seeks to preserve eloquence in its incarnation of *decorum*, which continues to espouse the moderate approach that makes it unique, while going beyond questions of propriety to include morality.⁸² A thinker who interestingly has a background in architecture and will go on to argue for simplicity of form and removal of embellishments in that domain, Laugier⁸³ posits the main difference between the two *coins* as residing in *judicium*. This reflects the danger mentioned at the very outset of this *Apologie de la musique française contre M. Rousseau*, within its "Avertissement:" if a great thinker possesses all but one of the essential constituents of a great orator—and especially if the one lacuna is good judgment—he might be able to convince the reader based on fundamentally-flawed beliefs.⁸⁴ Laugier takes the clever position that his side may be inferior to Rousseau's on all points except that one, most central aspect and goes on to apply this theory to Italian music. So, for both parties, the key to finding the essence of both eloquence and music lies in a return to ancient principles.

⁸² The moral grounds of *decorum* are seen in the previously-mentioned questioning of Rousseau's economic motivations and his desire to improve his standing. Morand and Estève take this notion of self-interest and use it to demonstrate the other side's recklessness: "des Ecrivains... qui mettent le feu aux Temples et aux Moissons pour faire parler d'eux," *Justification de la musique française. Contre la querelle qui lui a été faite par un Allemand et un allobroge. Adressée par elle-même au coin de la reine le jour qu'avec Titon et l'Aurore elle s'est remise en possession de son théâtre*, in *QB*, 1081.

⁸³ Laugier will go on to author the influential *Essai sur l'architecture* (1755), supporting purity in architecture inherited from nature and inspired by ancient Greek temples. Despite this reverence towards the Ancients after the camps' clear demarcations have been drawn, his alignment with the *coin du roi* is not surprising, for his notion of architectural simplicity directly derived from nature bears a resemblance to Rameau's theories of *corps sonores* and his view of music as a self-contained entity.

⁸⁴ Laugier, *Apologie de la musique française*, in *QB*, 1148.

A melodious return to antiquity

Although a few thinkers make an effort—at least in pretense—to find a middle ground, choosing a side is a prerequisite to entering a debate that is fiercely divided into two *coins*. Even the more even-tempered participants are seen as partisan, with Jourdan noting of Diderot that “il s’élève une voix du milieu du parterre, pour proposer un accommodement entre les deux coins; on s’adresse au petit et au grand Prophète, etc., et nous sommes tous compris dans cette abréviation; mais je crains que ce ne soit un espion du coin de la Reine qui vient fonder le terrain...”⁸⁵ Although perhaps unfair, Jourdan’s comment reveals the need to be able to define contributions and hold authors accountable not only for their statements but for their *coin*, albeit in a fashion more inflexible than in previous quarrels: while variances on certain issues are accepted, crossing over to the opposite side is not. If there is one past rhetorical opposition on which the *querelle des bouffons* is mapped, it is the quarrel of the Ancients and Moderns but, whereas the Moderns originally defended opera as going beyond classical French tragedy and the Ancients decried the loss of theater, the Ancients are presently the ones who most prominently support innovative forms such as Italian opera and the Moderns represent the party that seeks to preserve more traditional forms or at least ensure that the rules that have been handed down by classical French theater are respected. There are therefore shifts and reversals in the roles afforded each side, even if the *coins* are patterned to a certain extent on previous quarrels. However, within this system of *coins*, the two sides are no longer strictly represented by a division of the Ancients and Moderns—despite a broad opposition that still follows this design—and it therefore becomes acceptable for attributes from one or the other to be claimed by thinkers

⁸⁵ Jourdan, *Seconde Lettre du correcteur des bouffons à l’écolier de Prague*, in *QB*, 576.

who are from either side. This interestingly allows both sides to perform a return to antiquity, as we began to explore above. The Italian side almost entirely aligns itself with the Ancients, although, as we saw previously, its governing theoretical approach could be considered modern. For their part, the partisans of French music embrace the Moderns in their valuation of harmony and support of Rameau, yet they also retain a number of ancient tendencies as their own in their conception of both eloquence and music.

The *coin du roi*'s flexibility in its alignment to such ideals is relatively newfound. Although there was movement within the camps during the quarrel of the Ancients and Moderns, it usually took the shape of an alternation between views at different phases in the debate.⁸⁶ During the *querelle des bouffons*, the French side varies its allegiances to the point of incorporating ideas from either side within exchanges or even within a given work, supporting the idea that the duality no longer governs the debate. At the same time, a paradox is felt in several exchanges due to the Ancients being the innovators in terms of music, while the Moderns are traditionalists.⁸⁷ Frederic II of Prussia, for instance, insists on this phenomenon in his description of the establishment's reliance on "vieilles coutumes" and narrow-mindedness in its

⁸⁶ See Fumaroli, "Les Abeilles et les araignées," 17.

⁸⁷ The terms "ancient" and "modern" have adjustable meanings according to the context but, in reality, there is a relative consistency in their uses: while the Ancients (who would be aligned with the Ancient party in the quarrel of Ancients and Moderns) take a "modern" approach to their music—earning them the pejorative term of "Novateurs," as noted below—but value a return to their perception of the ideals of ancient times, the Moderns (aligned with the Modern party) defend modern French values, and their music embraces both harmonic modernity and a basis in old (or "anciennes") French practices. Thus, Travenol's depiction of "ce Rousseau moderne" (*Arrêt du conseil d'état d'Apollon*, in *QB*, 895) is a criticism of his embrace of the latest fads and his failure to base his innovations on solid previous work or proven theories. This type of irresponsible approach, which intentionally ignores everything in between Greco-Roman times and present day—what Travenol goes on to call the "délicieuse satisfaction on goute à établir des principes rares, singuliers, des maximes toutes neuves..." in his second pamphlet (*La Galerie de l'académie royale de musique*, in *QB*, 1495)—, leads to spurious conclusions.

refusal to accept foreign ideas, as contrasted with the other side's position as "Novateurs."⁸⁸ Playing on the relationship of Ancients and Moderns, on the other side of the divide Rulhière similarly clearly enjoys entertaining the idea that the Moderns are aligned with tradition (describing their "ancient goût"), while the Ancients are the ones chasing the latest trends (making them the so-called "Novateurs," a term re-used in a positive light by Frederic II, as we just saw).⁸⁹ On this point, both sides therefore agree.

In its embrace of innovation, the *coin de la reine* takes a page from French classicism by viewing the return to the Ancients as a step towards the future of music (originality being based on their great works), rather than a return to the past, while the French side simultaneously embraces ancient taste and a rejection of the Ancients as a whole, leading to a greater multiplicity of positions. For instance, Castel is one of the strongest supporters of French ideals and describes writing as essential to the scientific approach, yet this very description includes the remark "Point de Livres avant les Grecs, sauf les Livres Sacrés."⁹⁰ Such commentary reveals Castel's deep reverence towards the ancient Greeks, positioning them as the source of modern theories, as opposed to the realm of religion, thereby creating a sort of fusion of modern and ancient ideals. He similarly embraces the notion of "je ne sais quoi," previously espoused by Du Bos—one of the most illustrious members of the Ancients during the quarrel of the Ancients and the Moderns—and views the ancient concept of "suavité"⁹¹ as giving French music its special essence, as we saw above. It is thus possible for *coin du roi* thinkers to unabashedly incorporate

⁸⁸ Frédéric II, *Lettre au public par sa majesté le roi de Prusse*, in *QB*, 594.

⁸⁹ Rulhière, *Jugement de l'orchestre de l'opéra*, in *QB*, 444.

⁹⁰ Castel, *Lettres d'un académicien de Bordeaux sur le fonds de la musique, à l'occasion de la Lettre de M. R*** contre la musique française*, in *QB*, 1387.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 1389.

any number of key ancient principles and use them to bolster concepts such as French *bon goût*. Similarly, in another instance, Castel creates an implicit opposition between “vieux” and “ancien,” attacking the *coin de la reine* for ridiculing “[les] hommes de la *vielle Perruque*”⁹² by calling them thusly. These are the partisans of Lully’s music, including illustrious figures like Campra and Rameau himself, whom Castel sees as ridiculed through such an appellation. Clearly, the adjective “vieux” has none of the cachet of the term “ancien,” and for Castel the representatives of the former are a continuation of—rather than a break from—those of the latter. Caux de Cappeval similarly comments on the *coin de la reine*’s “manque de respect,”⁹³ but accepts the division between recent French history and ancient Greece: in this battle, the Italian side does not value the traditions that preceded them. This lack of reverence takes a turn for the worse as Caux de Cappeval goes on to depict Italian *libretti* as a mere facsimile of French theater—without original additions—, entailing a form of plagiarism: in Metastasio’s *opere serie*, one finds “la plupart des Héros de nos Tragédies Françaises, avec leurs situations un peu déguisées: c’est Corneille et Racine assez adroitement refondus dans un moule d’Italie.”⁹⁴ Granted, Caux de Cappeval has turned his attention away from music to its textual inspiration but his attack on the other side’s refusal of modernity is palpable: the partisans of Italian music are so unwilling to consider French traditions that they fail to notice when the latter form the very basis of the works they laud. In both instances, the thinker shows his allegiance to modernity in pointing out the way in which the *coin de la reine* glosses over French contributions through its return to the ancient. The conflicting tendencies illustrated by Castel

⁹² Caux de Cappeval, *Apologie du goût français*, in *QB*, 1562.

⁹³ *Ibid*, 1563.

⁹⁴ *Ibid*.

and Caux de Cappeval's approaches reveal a shift: in the *querelle des bouffons*, the duality of Ancients and Moderns is still viewed as useful but no longer forms the central dividing line or the main axis around which arguments are built. For both sides, embracing the Ancients on certain occasions is a valuable step in persuading the reader to choose one's music.

On the Italian side, ancient precepts are a prerequisite to good music. The ideal of simplicity favored by the *coin de la reine* is very much conceived as a return to the values of antiquity. It is present from the quarrel's onset. For instance, in his *Lettre à une dame d'un certain âge* Holbach refers to *Il Giocatore* and *La Serva Padrona* as vastly benefiting from their simple, concise nature: "Il y a plus de génie dans un seul de ces morceaux que dans nos immenses compilations de notes."⁹⁵ Foreshadowing D'Alembert's endorsement of music and eloquence that favor concision at the very conclusion of the *querelle*, this early statement uses the same rhetorical *topos* to indicate that ancient principles of rhetoric—simplicity and clarity chief among them—will be the best judge of music throughout the debate. French music has already lost the battle in its modern complications, which reveal the drawbacks of so-called progress. In the *coin du roi*, Travenol uses the notion to his creative advantage by positing the idea that the *coin de la reine*'s theories are almost-literally ancient Greek to the modern—and not just Modern—French reader: "Il s'agit de Français, et vous nous parlez Grec. ... Est-ce en parlant un langage que nous ne connaissons pas, que vous prétendez nous convaincre?"⁹⁶ Realizing the centrality of the Ancients for the Italian side, Travenol plays on the distance between ancient and contemporary culture, merging the temporal, the linguistic and the geographic to create a link to

⁹⁵ Holbach, *Lettre à une dame d'un certain âge*, in *QB*, 125.

⁹⁶ Travenol, *La Galerie de l'académie royale de musique*, in *QB*, 1505.

the recurring theme of foreignness. Once again, it is not so much the Ancients that are under attack as the *coin de la reine*'s failure to make them relatable in its rejection of French mores.

The very embrace of *pathos* by the partisans of Italian music supports this view: its violence mirrors ancient eloquence but is considered a complete lack of *decorum* by the French side. As we have seen, the position of “émouvoir” as music's first goal becomes increasingly clear as Rousseau's *Lettre sur la musique française* and, indeed, the quarrel progress, leading many in the opposing camp to indicate that in eloquence, as in music, excessive force is inappropriate. Castel demonstrates this with relative subtlety: whereas the Italians are characterized by a negative superlative (“trop... trop...”) in his *Bordelais* academician's eighth letter, the French are defined by a positive comparative (“plus... plus...”),⁹⁷ reminding the reader that his opponents have gone too far in more ways than one, while also supporting an approach to eloquent music that is not constructed on simplicity (“plus” painting additions as positive). Not only are the Italianists' arguments and music too violent but their dismissal of French culture is a rejection of the concept of building on previous arguments, as examined in the second part this chapter: while the *coin de la reine* is obsessed with (and blinded by) its own originality, the *coin du roi* builds on solid foundations, supplementing what has been created previously (the French “plus” being indicative of a basis in what is already there)—rather than seeking to supplant it—and its music thus stands a far greater chance of fulfilling the multifaceted goals of eloquence. So, in both approaches, ancient values are the measure of music's effectiveness.

Aware of this, thinkers in *coin de la reine* do exercise a certain degree of moderation, and repeatedly espouse the value of previous work. Thus, Rousseau makes two interesting choices in

⁹⁷ Castel, *Lettres d'un académicien de Bordeaux sur le fonds de la musique*, in *QB*, 1431.

a transitional moment of the *Lettre sur la musique française*, just before he begins his examination of the Italian language: he reintroduces harmony as an essential element of music (in its proper place, he will be sure to stress repeatedly later on), and declares not wanting to venture beyond “des idées qui nous sont connues” as the reason he forgoes an in-depth exploration of ideal music. The first point ensures Rousseau does not lose credibility and allows him to maintain a balanced position, while acknowledging harmony in the softest possible way. The second point, particularly interesting because more unexpected, gives the reader pause for thought in its brevity and seeming incongruity. One way to read this declaration is to take the author at his word and accept the implication that this is not the appropriate context for a full exploration of Italian music: after all, the pamphlet is entitled *Lettre sur la musique française*, which clearly sets limitations on its length and scope, and his audience might well not be ready for more earth-shattering theories than it already contains. As such, Rousseau proves that his side is fully aware of and capable of adhering to the practice of *decorum*. Another, slightly more cynical view to adopt would posit Rousseau as aware of his own limitations in analyzing the music of which he paints himself such an expert. However, why then does he even mention the possibility and potentially weaken his position? In this scenario, such a declaration serves the double purpose of showing that the author is capable of restraint and of linking the return to antiquity to the French reverence towards things past: the Ancients are not in diametrical opposition to the evolution of French culture but rather its very source, from which—rather than forming a continuation, as Castel suggests—French composers have deviated. This form of temperance is not unlike the *coin du roi*’s moderation through *decorum* as echoed by D’Alembert, who indicates that moments of great excitement and the use of *récitatif obligé* must

be rare in order to retain their impact.⁹⁸ Properly using rhetorical techniques is key, with great force reserved for the most important moments, in music as in eloquent speech—and perhaps the *coin de la reine*'s use of force is simply indicative of its having more such moments to underscore than the other side.

It is perhaps no coincidence, then, that Rousseau goes on to specifically address his *coin*'s vision of *decorum*. In order to transition to an examination of the Italian language, the thinker compares France's complex grammar to its leadership in all matters related to reason, and Italy's musical perfection to its language being "le plus propre."⁹⁹ *Decorum* thus forms a basis of Rousseau's language theories: the best music is the one whose linguistic inspiration is the most natural. The ideal of "la langue... [la] plus propre," one that is "douce, sonore, harmonieuse et accentuée plus qu'aucune autre,"¹⁰⁰ is a nostalgic call to return to the state closest to perfection.¹⁰¹ In the case of music, the Italians are the closest to replicating this ideal, by way of the Latin transmission bridge and, in so doing, achieve the greatest correspondence of *verba* to *res*. The emphasis placed on the importance of language in relation to music not only underlines the superiority of certain disciplines (as seen in the previous chapter, those born directly out of language, such as philosophy, rhetoric and literature) over others (also descended from language but less directly, such as music and painting)—a reminder of the *philosophes*' natural superiority in this battle—and the therefore logical link between musical and linguistic perfection that

⁹⁸ D'Alembert, *De la Liberté de la musique*, in *QB*, 2253.

⁹⁹ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 149.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁰¹ Cultural progress comes at a great cost for Rousseau. In particular, see the depictions of Egypt, Greece and Rome that occupy a good portion of the first part (pp. 41-47) of his 1750 *Discours sur les sciences et les arts*. With civilization comes depravation, while those who did not value progress—i.e. the sciences and arts—(such as the Persians or Spartans) are strongest.

rationally (rather than purely nostalgically) justifies a return to ancient ideals. It also implies an inevitable position of victory over Rameau in that the possibility of any demonstrable roots for “pure” music, other than music itself and the corresponding physical framework envisioned by Rameau, discredits the overall framework of Rameau’s claims and thus greatly reduces the credibility of the *coin du roi* in its linguistic, logical and rhetorical lacks.

Similarly, playing with the meanings of words such as “harmonie” allows for almost imperceptibly guiding the text towards specific topics and a valuing of ancient concepts. Thus, while Rousseau rejects prominent harmony in music, he advocates complete harmony between language and music, forming a sort of linguistic *ethos*—a reaffirmation of the correspondence of verba (music) to res (language) that cannot exist in the French side’s *vraisemblance*—¹⁰² in music, which can be perceived in statements such as:

... une phrase musicale se développe d’une manière plus agréable et plus intéressante quand le sens du discours, longtemps suspendu, se résout sur le verbe avec la cadence, que quand il se développe à mesure, et laisse affaiblir ou satisfaire ainsi par degrés le désir de l’esprit, tandis que celui de l’oreille augmente en raison contraire jusqu’à la fin de la phrase.¹⁰³

¹⁰² Although the *coin du roi* claims “le vrai” as its own (see p. 349), its opponents see French *decorum* as based on the *merveilleux*. For the *coin de la reine*, this is artificial: *vraisemblance* is not authentic, unlike that which is *vrai*. As such, the French idea of music goes against the moral aspect of eloquence and is disproved on this basis. The notion that Italian opera is unauthentic in its singsongy nature is countered by Diderot (*Les Trois Chapitres*, in *QB*, 510) with the idea that singing exists in everyday life and is therefore not unreal. He also uses the *Devin du village*’s setting (*Ibid.*, 505) as proof positive that ideal opera is realistic and based on life, in opposition with French opera’s elaborate settings and sets. Grimm, too, opposes *vrai* and *vraisemblable*, depicting French opera as wholly unbelievable (Grimm, *Le Petit Prophète de Boehmischbroda*, in *QB*, 150) and devoting a chapter of his pamphlet to attacking the *merveilleux* (*Ibid.*, 180). All of these elements reinforce the centrality of Italian music’s *decorum*—not only in style but also in content, as well as the correspondence between the two—in its partisans’ vision of the ancient.

¹⁰³ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 149.

Rousseau paints an image of complete coalescence between linguistic and musical structure: with this culmination and the most important points of language and music coinciding perfectly, the central position of *decorum* in its original rhetorical sense is reclaimed. This justifies the need to draw on ancient principles in considering music, while implicitly drawing a contrast between this type of valuable, rhetorical harmony and Rameau's overvaluation of the musical type.

Rousseau's depiction of France's only contact with music, as the latter evolved, being through an Italian allows the reader to conclude that a sort of purging through a return to antiquity—via Italy—is necessary. Prior to such a return, as exemplified by Italian music, harmony was to blame for the noise that passed for music, and it is in this spirit that Rousseau remarks that “quelques légères traces des fugues et dessins gothiques, et quelquefois de doubles et triples mélodies” remain, despite the Italians' best efforts to focus on “la perfection de la mélodie” and make their harmony “plus pure, plus simple”¹⁰⁴—in a word, ancient. Any traces of bad or excessive harmony in Italian music are due to its early entwinement with France. Providing historical context for the concurrent birth of ideal Italian music and evolution of perfect melody obviously joins the two elements. It also once again allows Rousseau to define certain limits and conditions for the quarrel. Attacking Italian music earlier than Corelli and Pergolesi becomes futile if there really was a rebirth with these composers and, cleverly, moments of polyphony and great harmony can now be blamed on history, on a lack of reverence towards the Ancients, and on France itself. If this is not enough, Rousseau also notes that moments such as the “mauvais quatuor”¹⁰⁵ in *La Femme orgueilleuse* (or *La Donna Superba*, a *dramma giocoso* performed early on by Bambini's troupe, as a *reprise* in December 1752) only

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 163.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*

occur in Italian comic operas, reminding us again that we should be comparing similar forms or that, to be fair in choosing only the repertoire of the *bouffons*, one might as well select French farces with such telling titles as *Le Baron de la Crasse*—thus calling for another level of *decorum*, this time demanding correspondence of form, from a conceptual standpoint. By choosing to cite works clearly lacking serious content, Rousseau entertains the reader and reminds him that, although the Italians have a serious genre that is perfection incarnate, even their comedic works are vastly superior to French forms—comedic or tragic—in their ability to respect core principles. Conversely, when the French go south, they dig themselves all the way to a point of no return.

Rousseau's constant call for simplicity camouflages a central problem for both eloquence and music. Both disciplines lead to a sort of elitism or selection process that is born out of the simultaneous failure and success of the rhetorical system: failure in its inability to sufficiently educate and success in its favoring of *bon goût* or enlightenment that could never really be expected to reach the masses. Thus, when Grimm laments the fact that the one good air from *Omphale* “n'est écouté que de quelques gens de goût,”¹⁰⁶ this reflects a flaw innate to rhetoric in its current, overly-technical embodiment. Paradoxically, this overly-complex music is due to performance and compositional practices having been pushed to their utmost and, as a result, reduced to an efficient, systematized simulacrum of their ideal form. However, while music has managed to reconfigure itself in Italy—through its embrace of ancient ideals—so as to have appeal and relevance for all audiences, French rhetorical discourse, like French music, is not proving as flexible—or fixable. We saw this in Chapters 1 and 2, with the recurrent critique on

¹⁰⁶ Grimm, *Lettre sur Omphale*, in *QB*, 25.

either side of the misuse or dearth of rhetorical principles, which led to the search for the central examined above. This sense that eloquence is becoming increasingly compromised appears throughout the pamphlets, including Diderot's *Au Petit Prophète de Boehmischbroda, au grand prophète Monet*, which contains harsh indictments of the participants' lack of *decorum*. The thinker thus notes that "Nous avons reçu de vous toutes les instructions, toute la lumière qu'il était possible de tirer de l'ironie et même de l'invective."¹⁰⁷ The observation appears in the text's opening, as Diderot considers the Ancients, describing the quarrel's partakers as closer to the "animaux féroces que les Anciens exposaient dans leurs amphithéâtres"¹⁰⁸ than the great orators. So, there exists a completely inappropriate correspondence between the quarrel's authors and wild animals, while the link to the core values of eloquence has been lost. The sentiment is echoed on both sides, leading to a general sense that the art of eloquence is becoming untenable, whether because of a desire for strong impact or an overemphasis on technique. If French eloquence is going by the wayside, so is French music, leading even the strongest supporters of the *coin du roi*, such as Cazotte, to feel its decline: "Ce sont-là, Madame, les ouvrages et les sujets dont les succès ont paru menacer notre Chant Français, et en particulier notre Opéra d'une chute prochaine et absolue."¹⁰⁹

For the *coin de la reine*, part of the solution to forming good music is a return to antiquity through the embrace of Italian music. In the opposite camp, there is a break from such reverence—complete for some, but blended for most with a concurrent sense that French music has retained the most important components of ancient eloquence, shattering once and for all the

¹⁰⁷ Diderot, *Au Petit Prophète de Boehmischbroda, au grand prophète Monet; à tous ceux qui les ont précédés et suivis, et à tous ceux qui les suivront*, in *QB*, 418.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁹ Cazotte, *La Guerre de l'opéra*, in *QB*, 323.

notion that the *querelle des bouffons* is merely a reiteration of Ancients versus Moderns.¹¹⁰ This leads defenders of French music like Castel to declare that its genre is ancient in spirit.¹¹¹ If the *coin du roi* therefore implies that the Italians have focused on form and sacrificed essential attributes in their quest for excessive force, Rousseau and his cohorts see harmony as overwhelming and overthrowing these key components to the point that it is impossible to think clearly or understand what is being conveyed.¹¹² In both cases, music's eloquence is based on a valuing of ancient principles—and *decorum* in particular—as a way of ensuring that the central tenets of eloquence are safeguarded.

II. The quarrel as conversation

There is a veritable profusion of debates and quarrels during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (the most notable being the *querelle du dessin et du coloris* and the *querelle des Anciens et des Modernes*, accompanied by more specialized subsets like the earlier *querelle*

¹¹⁰ Edelstein notes that during the quarrel of the Ancients and the Moderns, while the former could find ways to accommodate recent achievements, the latter “could not find any place for antiquity” (*The Enlightenment: A Genealogy*, 37). See also Jean-Paul Sermain’s “Le Code du bon goût (1725-1750),” in which he shows how the Moderns during the second, early eighteenth century instance of the quarrel use the principles of French classicism to combat antiquity and do indeed devalue ancient ideas—“Les Modernes refusent aux Anciens toute prééminence, et souvent tout mérite...” (914)—, completely rejecting any sort of input from ancient sources.

¹¹¹ Castel, *Lettres d’un académicien de Bordeaux sur le fonds de la musique*, in *QB*, 1429.

¹¹² D’Alembert draws another interesting comparison involving architecture, likening harmony to a house’s foundations. He does not contradict Rameau’s theories but denies that harmony is aesthetically preferable or more important than what is built on top of it: “c’est à peu près comme si on voulait soutenir que les fondements d’une maison soient l’endroit le plus agréable à habiter, parce que tout édifice repose dessus” (*De la Liberté de la musique*, in *QB*, 2270). It is difficult to know what to make of this statement, which seeks to somewhat reconcile Rameau’s views and those of the *coin de la reine* (as we have seen is D’Alembert’s wont), but it is clear that it contains hidden significance and that certain elements—no matter how important—should remain hidden.

des Lullistes et des Ramistes or the forthcoming *querelle des Gluckistes et des Piccinistes*)¹¹³ but the *querelle des bouffons* seems both to have broader implications and to be more concerned with eloquence itself than many others. The sense of France's decline—in its eloquence, its music and, more generally, in its approach to artistic production and performance as an act with social and political implications—¹¹⁴ felt by members of both *coins* is a motivating factor in the *querelle*'s rhetorical framing. An open, lively debate is a way of bringing to light the need for action and of exploring competing solutions. It is also a means of fostering true exchanges, which can be concurrently vigorous and well thought-through. I see evidence that, based on the translation of eloquence from the oral to the written domain we uncovered in the last chapter, the quarrel can thus be viewed as occupying a unique position in the history of conversation, taking the latter's precepts from the oral to the written form and from the private to the public sphere. One way of explaining the phenomenon is as a merging of the notions of *volonté générale* and *volonté particulière*: in the *querelle*, writing allows a thinker's particular theory to become public (and possibly political)¹¹⁵ in the act of published writing, amalgamating his personal views with

¹¹³ See Chapter 3 for an overview of the quarrel of line versus color and its impact on the *querelle des bouffons*. The quarrel of *Lullistes* and *Ramistes* begins with the 1733 opening of Rameau's *Hippolyte et Aricie* (the fifty year old composer's first *tragédie lyrique*), opposing the defenders of Lully as representative of the Académie Royale de Musique and Rameau's supporters (famously termed "Rameauneurs" by Voltaire). As for the quarrel of *Gluckistes* and *Piccinistes*, which takes place two decades after the *querelle des bouffons* (beginning in 1775 and ending with Gluck's departure from Paris following the ill-received performance of his last opera, *Écho et Narcisse*, in 1779), the debate follows a recognizable division between partisans of Italian music in the supporters of Piccini and defenders of Gluck as the new embodiment of French opera. The dispute stays tightly focused on music itself as a popular topic of discussion and, unlike Rameau, Gluck does not become embroiled in the exchanges.

¹¹⁴ Take, for instance, the rhetorical notion of *ornatus* we just examined. Marc Fumaroli explains that it extends to the ethnological idea of "systèmes ornementaux, vêtements, parures, peintures du corps, qui construisent dans les sociétés traditionnelles un ordre du monde et une norme sociale" (*Histoire de la rhétorique dans l'Europe moderne: 1450-1950*, 10). One can therefore understand how such a concept is central to the *coin du roi*'s perspective and how the decline in the eighteenth century of the enumerated elements associated with it could be perceived as dangerous. It is on such grounds that saving eloquence becomes vital.

¹¹⁵ Patrick Riley shows in "The General Will Before Rousseau" that these notions are born in the seventeenth century but take on their political significance during the Enlightenment.

his ethical obligation to serve the public and the latter's position as both interlocutor and judge. This is partly an outcome of the *locus communis* (or *lieu commun*) that allows for exchange undergoing significant changes, especially in the performing arts (with the recent creation of the *académies*, the various *théâtres de foire*, etc.), and the written text offering itself as a more practical, perhaps more effective and certainly more wide-reaching alternative.

The quarrel's hidden subtext

In addition to establishing a dialog on the value of eloquence and music, conversation during the quarrel involves making public and record for posterity what the *Journal de Trévoux* calls—in January 1752, shortly before Grimm publishes his *Lettre sur Omphale*—a “littérature secrète.” Through such a notion, Rousseau's concept of the author as a literary citizen¹¹⁶ is expanded to a more generalized act of writing as incorporating subtext, whether political or other. In fact, the greater ability to integrate an element of secrecy directly into the exchanges is one of the appeals of a system of exchanges that fully embraces all the written form has to offer. This subtext is a key component of the quarrel's very eloquence, serving the dual purpose of enabling a necessary textual multilayering—essential to reaching varied readers, as well as exploring numerous topics, as we saw in the first chapter—, while also enabling “une Littérature

¹¹⁶ See Kelly's *Rousseau as Author*, as referenced in Chapter 3.

secrète, qui excite les autres à se produire de la même façon,”¹¹⁷ thereby turning traditions of oral transference dating back to ancient times into a quarrel based on the notion of written, collective *memoria* we uncovered and that, as we will see further on, uses exchanges to form a growing organism. According to Rousseau, during the *querelle* and even once it is over, this is really the only way of speaking (or writing) out against the monarchy. However, in the post-quarrel decades, his attacks become far more overt, as we have seen. For example, in *La Nouvelle Héloïse*, after explicitly establishing French opera as the embodiment of the crown (through its representative, the Académie Royale de Musique), he goes on to depict its singers in what can only be the effect of a political system that has lost its relevance and consequently does all it can to retain the limelight and dupe onlookers with its displays:

On voit les actrices presque en convulsion, arracher avec violence ces glapissements de leurs poumons, les poings fermés contre la poitrine, la tête en arrière, le visage enflammé, les vaisseaux gonflés, l'estomac pantelant; on ne sait lequel est le plus désagréablement affecté de l'œil ou de l'oreille; leurs efforts font autant souffrir ceux qui les regardent, que leurs chants ceux qui les écoutent, et ce qu'il y a de plus inconcevable est

¹¹⁷ The full description of this secret “literature” is provided by the appropriately anonymous “M. R. P.” in “Article VII, lettre au P. B. J. sur des ouvrages qui ne seront point imprimés,” *Mémoires pour l'histoire des sciences et des beaux arts*, v. 1, 121:

On entend par ces *Ouvrages* une multitude de productions Littéraires auxquelles les Auteurs refusent l'éclat de l'impression. Paris en est rempli; quelques unes sont connues d'un petit nombre de Gens de Lettres, et mériteraient de paraître en public. ... Nos Mémoires font un dépôt public, qu'il est permis à toutes personnes de grossir et de consulter. L'Anonyme s'y garde tant qu'on veut, et de la manière qu'on veut. On s'y trouve ou caché dans la foule si l'on n'aime pas le grand jour, ou distingué du vulgaire, si l'on ose un peu davantage. ... L'Auteur donne lui-même un exemple: en gardant l'Anonyme, il ne laisse pas de communiquer une Littérature secrète, qui excite les autres à se produire de la même façon.

que ces hurlements sont presque la seule chose qu'applaudissent les spectateurs.¹¹⁸

Such boldness is at least in part possible in print because of the work's status as a novel, whereas the challenge for the writers of the quarrel is to convey these sorts of ideas through the many folds of their very real and very public debate. Its written form allows this to be done to an extent not possible in oral *fora*, in great part thanks to a vast subtext born out of traditions such as *littérature secrète* and the selection of a musical topic with a long history of theoretical works that aids the quarrelers in their act of dissimulation.

In searching for and partaking in this phenomenon, the two *coins*' call for close reading is redoubled. It also provides a pleasurable challenge to the quarrel's participants, such as Frederic II of Prussia who enjoys "choses secrètes" and the pleasure of "les découvrir."¹¹⁹ One wonders if his own use of peculiar names such as "Zopenbrug" or the "Prince de Zipentzerbst"—both beginning with the letter "Z," containing "en" in the middle and having a stereotypically German ring—could not be a way of indicating the existence of a coded reading. The obvious pleasure experienced by the author in writing his letters, combined with the serious exploration of varied topics, calls for the reader to similarly fully immerse himself in his own role. This mandate of close analysis also allows authors such as Rousseau to incorporate moments of theoretical divergence from their core ideas or even perhaps a certain level of uncertainty or tentative

¹¹⁸ Rousseau, *Julie ou la Nouvelle Héloïse*, 204.

¹¹⁹ Frédéric II, *Lettre au public par sa majesté le roi de Prusse*, in *QB*, 590. For this contributor, there is obviously pleasure in the political element of hiding and uncovering, but he also draws a clear parallel to music, its centrality in courtly life, and its particular propensity to facilitate debates about other topics, including politics.

exploration. Along these lines, Rousseau turns to music for a model on dealing with ideas that cannot be made to directly support the main thought, in this case expressed by melody:

Que si le sens des paroles comporte une idée accessoire que le chant n'aura pas pu rendre, le musicien l'enchâssera dans des silences ou dans des tenues, de manière qu'il puisse la présenter à l'auditeur sans le détourner de celle du chant. L'avantage serait encore plus grand si cette idée accessoire pouvait être rendue par un accompagnement contraint et continu, qui fît plutôt un léger murmure qu'un véritable chant, comme serait le bruit d'une rivière ou le gazouillement des oiseaux: car alors le compositeur pourrait séparer tout à fait le chant de l'accompagnement... mais ceci demande une expérience consommée, pour éviter la duplicité de mélodie.¹²⁰

At first glance, Rousseau seems to suggest that accessory ideas should disappear in moments of silence but, in reality, it is music he seeks to make disappear or lessen to an appropriate level. The current Italian practice, according to Rousseau's depiction, is to have moments of silence or "tenues" accompany the singer's telling of facts immaterial to the main story. However, Rousseau envisions a more ideal situation in which these moments would still incorporate music but within a system that would reflect the different levels of discourse: the most central idea or subject would always remain in the melody as "véritable chant," while the accessory parts would be given different levels of prominence based on their importance. The least important elements would be reduced to little more than a "léger murmure" and this is where Rousseau's argument becomes slightly puzzling: he seems to suggest that this ideal musical form would then include types of music that are in fact "bruit" (against which he warns repeatedly) and, even more

¹²⁰ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 160.

surprising, that would create a division between the melody and the accompaniment (which goes against his “*unité de mélodie*”). Granted, this would only happen in specific instances and seems to be more a question of decibels than musical content, but Rousseau has just finished emphasizing that “*unité de mélodie*” must *always* exist. It is no surprise, then, that he finishes his argument by declaring that “*ceci demande une expérience consommée, pour éviter la duplicité de mélodie.*” The statement is clearly intended as a response to the doubts and questioning that the reader has almost certainly just experienced reading about the possibility for the composer to “*séparer tout à fait le chant de l’accompagnement*” but it does not do anything to explain the idea. The latter still seems oddly out of place within this section of the letter on “*accompagnement à l’unison,*” where one expects Rousseau to hold his ground, as he has concerning the roles of harmony and melody, for instance. Whatever the reason, this passage strongly supports the incorporation of a variety of levels of discourse and of hidden aspects, be they in content or in structure.

In fact, the very peculiarity of Rousseau’s argument could be seen as inciting the reader to further reflection: abiding by eloquence’s aim of *docere*, an indication of hidden content is provided in order for the reader to push himself to learn something from the argument being presented. In so doing, we are more likely to retain what we discover—increasing our own positive *memoria*—and we realize that concepts such as accompaniment using unison are subsets of a larger idea and consequentially less crucial to Rousseau than the overarching argument (which concerns the primacy of melody). This allows Rousseau to reserve greater inflexibility for his big theses, while also revealing his musical theory to be less heavy-handed or lacking in subtlety than some critics contend. A quick perusal of this passage might yield such an

estimation but in heeding Rousseau's repeated calls for attentive reading, a difference between the author's overall philosophy and the arguments it contains becomes perceptible: while the former must remain intact and always pointing in one direction—illustrated in the way the closing of the passage quoted above returns to the primary argument of “*unité de mélodie*” through its inverse concept of “*duplicité de mélodie*,” drawing everything together and setting the reader back on his intended path—, the illustrations, proof and technical details that constitute it (such as the possible divisions between song and accompaniment, in specific instances) do not always have to perfectly coincide with it. Once again, the separation Rousseau finds in his musical evidence points the reader to a mirror concept within his own vision of eloquence: by looking at how the component parts of eloquence and music can work in concert with—or battle, creating a breach of *decorum*—the overarching guide of authorial intent or melody, the reader will find two possible paths. Thus, there is good noise (of the kind described here, an exact duplicate of nature that works in concert with melody) and bad noise (of Rameau's variety, artificially constructed and destructive to melody). Separation follows the same pattern: the good kind is Rousseau's (possibly separated in form but still serving melody as the overarching guide) and the bad Rameau's (so divided that it results in complete disorder, and an overvaluing of the accessory, through pervasive harmony). The careful reader further realizes that, while these arguments are applied music itself, they are also linked to theory and the act of creation, going back to the idea of authorial intent from Chapter 3. If one pushes the principle of duality—in the constant presence of pairs of ideas and the sense that any overt notion is matched by a dissimulated idea—to the fullest in this passage, the final statement can in fact be seen as a play on words serving Rousseau's main contention. “*Duplicité de mélodie*”—the idea of an exact

inverse to the omnipresent notion of “unité de mélodie” that contributes to melody’s weakening and possible annihilation through the loss of this crucial unity—is itself indicative of a doubling as compared to the primary concept of “unité,” but its duality can also be found in the direct attack on Rameau’s version of the separation of instruments and voice—complete in the inappropriate autonomy of the former from the latter—through omnipresent harmony. In this light, “duplicity” fully takes on its treacherous connotation (the linguistic origins of the voice having been betrayed) and serves as further evidence that Rousseau never loses sight of his ultimate goal. This is the mark of a seasoned orator, linguist and philologist who uses his varied skills to weave multiple theoretical and thematic threads into rich textual fabrics that prioritize a main goal even within these subsets of ideas.

The *coin du roi* also overwhelmingly supports such hidden aspects,¹²¹ as can be seen in the frequently clever use of descriptive terms to create allusions for the reader. For example, Travenol calls Rousseau a “Copiste de Musique”¹²² in the titles of both of his pamphlets. Here,

¹²¹ There are some exceptions to this support of an underlying literature, which are mostly focused on the lack of clarity engendered by the latter. Thus, Ozy writes of Rousseau’s *Lettre*: “il me paraît qu’elle ne ressemble pas mal, pour me servir d’une comparaison de l’Auteur, aux écritures en chiffres qu’on ne peut lire sans en avoir la clef,” *Lettre sur celle de M. J.J. Rousseau citoyen de Genève, sur la Musique*, in *QB*, 874. If even the most educated of readers cannot make sense of a text, it cannot be eloquent, a fact reflected by Travenol in statements such as “femmes, hommes, Musiciens, ou non Musiciens, nous ne comprenons rien à votre jargon” (*La Galerie de l’académie royale de musique*, in *QB*, 1496). The lack of effectiveness in reaching *any* type of audience has to do with Travenol’s view that, rather than building a subtext, Rousseau is using the wrong language (that of linguistics) to talk about music.

¹²² Travenol, *Arrêt du conseil d’état d’Apollon, rendu, en faveur de l’orchestre de l’opéra, contre le nommé J.-J. Rousseau, copiste de musique, auteur du Devin du village, et de l’écrit intitulé, Lettre sur la musique française, etc. Extrait des registres du conseil d’état d’Apollon*, in *QB*, 888, and *La Galerie de l’académie royale de musique, contenant les portraits, en vers, des principaux sujets, qui la composent en la présente année 1754. Dédiée à Jean-Jacques Rousseau de Genève, copiste de musique, philosophe, orateur, grammairien, historien, théologien, mathématicien, peintre, poète, musicien, comédien, médecin, chirurgien, apothicaire, etc. etc. Par un zélé partisan de son système sur la musique*, in *QB*, 1489. The second title attacks Rousseau’s lack of focus and expertise, beginning with some possible combinations and gradually progressing towards clearly specious ones (“Médecin, Chirurgien, Apothicaire”). This draws attention to the ridiculousness of believing oneself to be an authority in every field, and Rousseau’s tendency to meddle in too many domains, indicating that even in the quarrel’s hidden subtext, focus and decorum must be maintained.

too, the reader can find double meaning: Rousseau is in fact a known “copiste” by trade, but the term also conjures up the attacks proffered against him by Rameau and others that his musical compositions are so uneven in quality, that the few good parts—so out of character with the rest of his body of work—can only be explained by an act of musical plagiarism.¹²³ Within this context, the insistence on Rousseau’s function as a “copiste”—especially juxtaposed immediately with the reminder that he is “Auteur du *Devin*”¹²⁴ (the latter being prominently featured in the accusations)—creates an implicit indication that his written work may be copied, if not literally, then in the sense of a lack of originality. Beyond such simple instances of implied readings, the *coin du roi* also works to build a level of hidden complexity that it claims French music favors through its greater depth. Rameau even notes that proper use of harmony creates a sort of internal layering that resembles illusion but goes further by creating the effect of elements not actually present. This positive dissimulation is revealed in the description of the “sentiment qu’on éprouve du Chromatique,”¹²⁵ which Rameau is careful to indicate takes place without actual chromatic intervals. This notion of *actio*—appearing a certain way through the use of technique—is not merely illusion and makes good use of *ethos* because the chromaticism, though absent in its physical incarnation, exists by harmonic implication. For Rameau, this justifies the need to always look to harmony as explaining melody in a sort of epideictic discourse that

¹²³ Rameau’s contention that Rousseau’s first opera, *Les Muses galantes*, was too good to have been written by the *Génevois* caused the rift between the two men and is a defining moment in the *Confessions*. In the latter, Rousseau reports that Rameau called him “un petit pillard sans talent et sans goût” (Part 2, Book 7, in *Œuvres*, v. 1, 172) in front of Madame de La Poplinière and her guests, to everyone’s dismay. Such accusations stick, as Fétis goes on to note that certain of Rousseau may not have composed certain of his musical works, and Castil-Blaze claims to prove definitively that the music of *Le Devin du village* is written by a musician from Lyon named Granet, and that of *Pygmalion* by another named Coigniet (*Molière musicien*, v. 2, 409-426).

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*

¹²⁵ Rameau, *Observations sur notre instinct pour la musique et sur son principe*, in *QB*, 1815.

continually presents choices, with the underlying harmonic structure always providing the correct answer if listened to closely.

By contrast, the simplicity of the other side is summed up by Morand and Estève, their explanation appropriately hidden within a long footnote: “les gens de bon gout regardent comme une puérilité cette figure de Rhétorique, ou pour mieux parler, ce trope qui consiste à peindre par le son des mots... Voilà pourtant en quoi consiste principalement cette expression tant vantée de la Musique Italienne...”¹²⁶ Word painting is too obvious, too literal, allowing the Italian side only to touch the surface of what music—and eloquence—can do. For the *coin du roi*, the key to persuasion is through the mind, and the depth of its music is an illustration of its dominance in this area. Harmony is the very embodiment of this assertion, with Rameau declaring (in response to Rousseau’s assertions in his *Lettre sur la musique française*) that “C’est à l’Harmonie seulement qu’il appartient de remuer les passions, la Mélodie ne tire sa force que de cette source.”¹²⁷ Once again, harmony is depicted as a foundational element—positioning persuasion above imitation and thus strengthening the bond of eloquence and music—but the very notion that one could easily make the error that Rousseau commits in assigning music’s force to melody indicates that French music’s reliance on harmony gives it an underlying and innate subtext that is imperceptible to many an ear. One of harmony’s strongest supporters, the self-declared “harmonophile”¹²⁸ Laugier, draws an interesting portrait of Rousseau that seems to extend Rousseau’s error, turning it into an intentional violation of *ethos*: “Quoique je connus déjà le gout décidé de M. Rousseau pour le paradoxe, et les ressources que lui fournit son esprit pour

¹²⁶ Morand and Estève, *Justification de la musique française*, in *QB*, 1108.

¹²⁷ Rameau, *Observations sur notre instinct pour la musique et sur son principe*, in *QB*, 1736.

¹²⁸ Laugier goes on to publish the review entitled *Sentiment d’un harmonophile sur différents ouvrages de musique* in 1756.

donner une couleur de vérité aux idées les plus hardies et les plus singulières...”¹²⁹ Laugier’s endorsement of Rousseau’s *ingenium* (“les idées les plus hardies et les plus singulières”) appears far more genuine than is often the case, as confirmed a few pages later in his declaration that “le vrai genie est de toutes les Nations.”¹³⁰ In fact, it is precisely this very strong intellect, which can come from a foreign source, combined with the lack of the most essential rhetorical quality—*judicium*, as noted earlier—that lends to Rousseau his ability to give himself the appearance of veritable Frenchness through intentional deception (“pour donner une couleur de vérité”), thanks to which he “assujettit l’harmonie à ses idées.”¹³¹ Thus, through a seemingly simple idea that is developed over a few pages, Laugier incorporates a reading that depicts Rousseau as able to bend the French way of thinking to his will through an immoral—if powerful—use of rhetorical principles.

Clearly, the importance of French music’s long cultural heritage is a recurring theme. The Père Castel is one of the strongest proponents of French music as relying on and benefiting from a unique background. For him, these historical roots are key—much like the linguistic ones favored by Rousseau—to the formation of an extended form of *memoria* that helps define the French method of cultural assimilation and yields a particular form of music based on this enculturation.¹³² In this respect, the two *coins* are not far apart, with a hidden heritage of

¹²⁹ Laugier, *Apologie de la musique française contre M. Rousseau*, in *QB*, 1149.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, 1153.

¹³¹ *Ibid.* Rousseau’s use of *pathos* does not go unnoticed, with Laugier indicating that his opponent is “un esprit qui se livre à des inventions pleines de feu” (*Ibid.*).

¹³² Caux de Cappeval similarly advocates the need for young French composers to be steeped in French culture before they travel to Italy. There is a sense that one cannot properly appreciate new or foreign forms without having first become familiar with one’s own rich heritage—as well as a risk of innocent seduction (one might say almost a sort of conversion) by Italian music’s wily ways, if the enculturation has not taken place. See *Apologie du goût français*, in *QB*, 1570.

previous works playing an indispensable role for the two camps. As the conceiver of the *clavecin oculaire*,¹³³ Castel's comparisons between painting and music unsurprisingly abound, and one in particular reveals this type of eloquence—resulting from a long cultural history—unique to French music:

Comme la peinture est un *clair-obscur*, la Musique est un *grave aigu* dans sa notation correcte. La Peinture a deux façons de manier le clair-obscur, par mélange et par contraste. Le mélange de près à près fait les Portraits; le contraste fait le théâtral et pittoresque. Le grave-aigu est susceptible des deux mêmes emplois de mélange et de contraste. C'est par le mélange que nous peignons en Musique par nuances et par reflets. L'Italien brille par contraste, par les fortes ombres opposées aux fortes couleurs...¹³⁴

In this fascinating comparison, Castel obviously believes that both French and Italian music have their merits but sees the French ability to subtly mix its notes, as it does colors in painting, as more difficult to achieve and far more rewarding than the simple art of contrasting deployed by Italian composers. Once again, the modern notion (inspired from French classicism) of artistic production being closer to nature than its inspiration is at play: while the natural opposition of colors and sounds initially seems to call for their use one next to each other, the discovery of blending and melding them is in fact their real, natural—and hidden—intended use. In both cases, Italian music achieves the great impact sought by Ciceronian orators but when that is all it

¹³³ The “clavecin oculaire” (or ocular harpsichord) was a theoretical instrument conceived by Castel that would visually reproduce via colors what was being played, affecting the eyes and the ears together. Diderot sums it up as follows in the *Encyclopédie*: “instrument à touches analogue au clavecin auriculaire, composé d'autant d'octaves de couleurs par tons et demi-tons, que le clavecin auriculaire a d'octaves de sons par tons et demi-tons, destiné à donner à l'ame par les yeux les mêmes sensations agréables de mélodie et d'harmonie de couleurs, que celles de mélodie et d'harmonie de sons que le clavecin ordinaire lui communique par l'oreille,” Diderot, *Encyclopédie ou dictionnaire raisonné des arts, des sciences et des métiers*, v. 3, 511.

¹³⁴ Castel, *Réponse critique d'un académicien de Rouen*, in *QB*, 1475.

can do, this turns into the excessive force seen in Chapter 2, whereas the more intellectual and subtle French approach—if more reliant on education and measure, thus requiring patience—allows for far greater variation of expression, favoring increased eloquence in the long run and certainly fulfilling the call for a hidden subset of ideas. To this end, Castel later alludes to his eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth letters,¹³⁵ which do not exist and thus direct the reader to search for what cannot be seen (or heard, in the case of music) at first blush. The idea that some of the letters are missing further reinforces the importance of written conversation with back and forth responses and cross-references, inviting us to consciously ponder these factors. In fact, Castell goes on to “retell” what was written in his non-existent last letters,¹³⁶ incorporating the letters in a second-hand manner that endorses the pursuit of a secret literature and of cross-referencing.¹³⁷ If the former is achieved through a hidden subtext that engages the reader, the latter is a way of providing a similar but more overt and dynamic experience for the quarrel’s readers and participants alike.

Reciprocity through cross-referencing

We have seen that building on the work of others and conversing are essential attributes for the quarrel’s contributors. Such exchanges lead to a general broadening of knowledge, spurring intellectual curiosity and intensifying the complex web of references that spawns across the various contributions. Inherited from the “rhetoric of citations,” which itself came out of the debate of Atticism and Asianism (in which the former found inspiration in “sources” as a means

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, 1451.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, 1455.

¹³⁷ The claimed retelling of the non-existent letters also subtly reveals that Castel is really the author of both pamphlets, since this is the only way he could he know what is in these “missing” letters.

of resisting the “innovators”),¹³⁸ this notion of cross-referencing gives the quarrelers greater flexibility in achieving the aims of eloquence. It is endorsed by all—whether in conjunction with the embrace of modern ideas or in a return to antiquity—as a means of furthering a structured system of exchanges that respects individual stylistic and theoretical contributions, while allowing them to work towards—and holding them accountable for—the communal *ethos* of their *coin* in order to determine which contributions form the debate’s essential corpus. Appreciating the importance of participating in this reciprocal referencing, both as a way of giving each other credibility and making important works prominent, the writers make increasing use of techniques that take advantage of this effect. Thus, fables and anecdotal stories like the ones we saw in Chapter 1 (such as Rousseau’s Armenian and his use of Fontenelle, or Grimm’s *petit prophète*) are the basis for a number of quarrel pamphlets and effectively increase the references to these works. They additionally reinforce the relationship of eloquence and music in that their inspiration comes at least in part from the musical domain: the stories are utilized much in the way that opera is based on fables. Just as opera assimilates its inspiration in a manner that corresponds with the construction of its own world, the texts of the *querelle* fully integrate these stories into their chosen genre (whether, for instance, this is purely a work of criticism or a piece of satire) and grant them the status of historical evidence. Although nobody really believes the fables, the participants’ valuation of authorial intent and the rhetorical framework used to judge the quarrel (which includes employing *logos* as a means of proving or disproving theories as they are presented by each contributor) give this material a serious role. In so doing, opera itself

¹³⁸ Fumaroli shows in the final pages of *L’Âge de l’éloquence*, 685-706, how Ciceronian Atticism is at the root of the “rhétorique des citations,” which undergoes transformations throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, eventually forming an integral part of the *Belles-Lettres*.

becomes evidence by bringing its inspiration into the folds of the quarrelers' reflections on music: through the use of stories that are as outrageous as the ones found in operas, the writers seem to be acknowledging their part in music's success and trying to recapture this effectiveness in their texts by pointing to its basis in such rhetorical principles as *logos* (here transferred to theoretical output), *ethos* (using referencing as a form of validation) and *pathos* (through the resulting impact of the stories and their role in increasing the collective *memoria* that we will see has been created). So, something as seemingly simple as the telling of a story serves as a reminder for the reader to be attentive to references of all types, whether internal or external to a given text, and to never lose sight of the musical topic or rhetorical framework.

From even the most basic forms of referencing (be it to others or oneself), emerges a certain level of mutual respect both within the *coins* and between adversaries—or, inversely, the latter may be what leads to increased cross-referencing. Whatever the case, within this system, what is omitted from the *querelle*'s exchanges is as important as what is included. For instance, Rochemont accepts Rousseau's premise and abides by his rules of debate in his *Réflexions d'un patriote* but he does not directly engage with his opponent, and this lack of referencing is palpable within a context in which contributors repeatedly name one another. It is a way of indicating that Rousseau is not worthy of what is being constructed—a public, written conversation with certain responsibilities, as we will see in the next section—and such a lack of explicit referencing is therefore an act of exclusion. Thus, Jourdan is right to take offense when he receives no replies to his first letter, prompting him to write a second one that references the first: "... comme je l'ai déjà dit dans ma première Lettre sur laquelle ces Messieurs affectent de

garder un profond silence.”¹³⁹ The very real power of Rousseau and the *philosophes* (“ces Messieurs”) is felt in that, clearly and to the chagrin of the *coin du roi*, their opinion matters. Not responding is as telling as the most developed reply, prompting Jourdan to attempt a revival of his first effort, so as to avoid being driven out of the quarrel by such pregnant silence. In fact, his characterization of the *philosophes*’ silence as “profond” points to the need for careful consideration and respect. While this seems to have been achieved—as evidenced not only by Jourdan’s own depiction but also by Rousseau’s likely inspiration from several of his points, including his claiming of Lully for the French side and strange, half-hearted support of Rameau—,¹⁴⁰ without some sort of reply, there can obviously be no debate on the points this author considers essential, revealing our previously-examined authorial intent to be dependent on a work’s propagation through cross-referencing.

The *querelle des bouffons*’s very inscription within the long line of quarrels mentioned earlier renders this form of interaction essential, and many of the participants embrace it fully. For example, D’Alembert—one of the more measured, balanced participants from the *coin de la reine*, as noted earlier—fully accepts in *De la Liberté de la musique* Rousseau’s notion that the French have no music.¹⁴¹ It is clear from his writings that this is not his own view but, within the

¹³⁹ Jourdan, *Seconde Lettre du correcteur des bouffons à l’écolier de Prague*, in *QB*, 577.

¹⁴⁰ It is oddly by depicting Rameau’s *Zoroastre* as full of noise that Jourdan defines the composer as French, providing Rousseau with the basis of one of his central arguments: “Le fracas vous a séduit; vous avez crû que c’était une espèce de Musique Italienne; vous vous êtes trompés,” *Ibid.*, 578. Although the noise is portrayed as thought to be Italian in style, it is nevertheless what draws in the listener and therefore reflects Rameau’s skill. In his partial support of Rameau, Jourdan even goes on to complain that Rameau offers good harmony but no melody, foreshadowing Rousseau’s *Lettre sur la musique française*. This also provides Rousseau his inspiration for a grouping of Lully and Rameau that will give the *coin du roi* no choice but to fully back the latter, which it has yet to do at this stage of the quarrel (Jourdan’s *Seconde Lettre* being written six months before Rousseau’s *Lettre*).

¹⁴¹ D’Alembert, *De la Liberté de la musique*, in *QB*, 2274. Less surprisingly, D’Alembert also explicitly supports Rousseau’s “unité de mélodie” by quoting a passage in which his colleague explains that nothing in the bass line should distract or detract from the melody, *Ibid.*, 2269.

quarrel's framework, going against this principle would seriously weaken the *coin de la reine* and he is able to relativize the statement by showing it need not be taken in completely literal terms. So, there is a sense that certain fundamental principles—whether a continuation of previous quarrels or innovative ones created just for this debate—must be accepted and referenced on either side, just as certain major works are recognized by both sides as common points of contention. Indeed, using exemplary pieces of music and written works as emblems of either side (the *Lettre sur la musique française* for Rousseau and as representative of the *coin de la reine* in general, *Alceste* as Rameau's masterwork, Mondonville's *Titon et l'aurore* as an example of ideal French composition principles, *La Serva Padronna* as characteristic of the *bouffons*, ...) creates a body of evidence that is commonly known to all participants and upon which everyone more or less agrees.¹⁴²

This leads to the gradual transfer of *memoria* from its traditional position to a new location. The inception of this process can be seen in the repeated emphasis afforded *memoria* through the construction of extensive cross-referencing that uses the multi-leveling available thanks to the quarrel's written unique form that we will examine in the next section. The idea is put into action by Diderot, who references both the content and stylistic qualities of previous

¹⁴² For example, Rulhière makes frequent references to *Titon et l'aurore*, just as Jourdan does before him, and there is a sense no explanations are needed as to the choice, a fact confirmed by its frequent appearance in various publications, including Grimm's *Correspondance littéraire et philosophique*, twenty years later. *Titon* is used in this publication, v. 10, 86, as a way of explaining the departure of the *bouffons*, characterizing Mondonville as Rameau's replacement (which was not a theory put forward during the quarrel proper, although both composers had their admirers, as we have seen) and his opera as the first step in a series of events that were the undoing of the *coin de la reine*. Mondonville's retrospective presentation in this light by one of the *coin*'s most ardent supporters is not completely unexpected given the composer's increasingly emblematic position within the French camp. It is also perhaps not irrelevant that he found himself embroiled with Travenol (whom we have seen is a prominent supporter of the *coin du roi* during the quarrel) in 1758, and Mondonville's position as a director of the Concert Spirituel might have somewhat appealed to Grimm. Although the Concert Spirituel was mostly dedicated to the sacred repertory, its inclination towards Italian music and Pergolesi in particular—his *Stabat Mater* being one of its most frequently-performed pieces throughout Mondonville's tenure—shows a certain affinity between Mondonville and the Italian style and, thus, perhaps a new, more palatable direction for French music.

contributions in *Les Trois Chapitres, ou la vision de la nuit du mardi-gras au mercredi des cendres*: in addition to continuing Grimm's story, Diderot employs a style that not only respects the original author's form but also pays a veritable homage to the earlier text. In his continuation of Grimm's tale (in which the protagonist known as the *petit prophète*, a French musician and composer of little pieces in the French style, discovers with initial disbelief and amazement the nature of true music—i.e. Italian opera—, quickly realizing that what he had mistaken for music until then is a national embarrassment), Diderot reminds his reader of the *petit prophète*'s story through a retelling of key moments and integration of referential terms. For instance, he notes that the protagonist “devint rouge comme **la magicienne** quand elle chante,”¹⁴³ which references Grimm's depiction of the French soprano who knows everything “excepté chanter,”¹⁴⁴ and simultaneously mirrors the heading of Grimm's sixth chapter, entitled “La magicienne.” In addition to faithfully referencing Grimm's story and style, Diderot also ensures that his own creative essence is very much present, forming a sort of double respect of authorial intent (of the referenced author's intent and of his own) and increasing the position of *ethos* through this redoubled authenticity. This practice demonstrates the importance of cross-referencing that includes a furthering of what is being referenced, in order to continue the discussion and prevent stagnation—which is to say that it uses *memoria* properly by building upon previous work. Furthermore, it assists in the creation of a collective *memoria* by pinpointing or creating *leitmotifs*—very much in the musical fashion—that are not only referenced but also underscored for the reader. These eventually become instantly recognizable to quarrel authors and readers alike, operating a partial transfer: in addition to the author (who occupies the position of orator in

¹⁴³ Diderot, *Les Trois Chapitres*, in *QB*, 493, my emphasis.

¹⁴⁴ Grimm, *Le Petit Prophète de Boehmischbroda*, in *QB*, 149.

the written context), the reader must now acquire and use *memoria*. Clearly, the process is facilitated thanks to the aforementioned highlighting, which allows any attentive reader to pick up on his new role and thereby follow a musical model by also increasing his own *delectatio*. Thus, Grimm uses internal referencing through humor to place the emphasis on certain key points, such as the measure beater in French music, who becomes known as “le bucheron” from the moment he first coins the term in his *Petit Prophète de Boehmischbroda*¹⁴⁵ and goes on to be referenced as such in several subsequent works.¹⁴⁶ This will inspire even authors from the other side to directly respond to and build upon texts from the *coin de la reine*. For instance, Jourdan writes his *Correcteur des bouffons à l’écolier de Prague* as a direct continuation of Grimm’s text, replete with parallelisms and satire, as well as transformations (such as “votre Prophète, *qui n’en est pas un....*”)¹⁴⁷ and extensions.

In addition to the formation of this collective *memoria* and agreed-upon common canon, the quarrel texts themselves serve as a way to intertwine thematic threads and produce a cohesive debate that can be viewed as eloquent in its quick-fire exchanges, rather than merely within individual works. As already noted, Rousseau turns to the *Lettre sur Omphale* in more than one instance, creating a sort of refrain that punctuates the quarrel. He uses it as part of his framing of the quarrel in his *Lettre sur la musique française*, so that this text that has been included in the *querelle* by some scholars and excluded by others in fact occupies the dual status of being written outside of the quarrel (as we saw) but firmly roped into it by Rousseau. This movement of inclusion through referencing is the mirror opposite of the instances of intentional exclusion

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 143.

¹⁴⁶ See below, p. 367.

¹⁴⁷ Jourdan, *Le Correcteur des bouffons*, in *QB*, 195.

we just mentioned, but both achieve the same purpose of controlling the debate's corpus, in effect determining its textual—and, by extension, theoretical—limits.

Along these lines, one could wonder whether Rousseau's inclusion of a text written well before the quarrel's beginning might not constitute a contradiction of his own call for respecting authorial intent. This is not the case, and the validating proof once more lies in close reading: whether or not he is critical of Rameau in the *Lettre sur Omphale*, Grimm gives Rousseau his express approval to take his arguments in the direction he sees fit, not only through the opening lines examined previously but also in his depiction of those responsible for that quintessentially French “bon goût:”

C'est aux Philosophes et aux gens de Lettres que la Nation doit, même sans s'en douter, son goût devenu depuis peu général pour la bonne Musique, ainsi que pour tous les beaux-arts. C'est à leurs éloges que M. Rameau doit principalement la justice et les honneurs que toute la Nation lui rend aujourd'hui.¹⁴⁸

Put this way, Rousseau (a definite member of the “gens de Lettres” and at this point still aligned with the *philosophes*), Diderot and their colleagues are the arbiters of good taste, which authorizes—perhaps even encourages—Rousseau to declare Rameau to not be the incarnation of perfect music after all. This will entail the somewhat paradoxical form of modernity examined earlier, its notion of good taste being “souvent balancé par de vieux préjugés,”¹⁴⁹ in the ultimate form of a return to things ancient.

¹⁴⁸ Grimm, *Lettre sur Omphale*, in *QB*, 37.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 38.

Grimm does not receive any objections from his stated mentor. Following the techniques used in his “Avertissements” (as previously seen), Rousseau establishes his own authority to enter the debate, while stealthily questioning his main opponent’s right to partake in intellectual deliberations of this nature:

Je voudrais seulement tâcher d’établir quelques principes sur lesquels, en attendant qu’on en trouve de meilleurs, les maîtres de l’art, ou plutôt les philosophes, pussent diriger leurs recherches: car, disait autrefois un sage, c’est au poète à faire de la poésie et au musicien à faire de la musique, mais il n’appartient qu’au philosophe de bien parler de l’une et de l’autre.¹⁵⁰

Here, Rousseau not only clearly challenges the right Rameau has claimed for his own to meddle in affairs of philosophy (never mentioning the composer but alluding to him with the label of “musicien”) but also grants himself this same right, *de facto*, as a *philosophe*. Beyond referencing the guiding role of the *philosophes* in this century of enlightenment and questioning Rameau’s right to enter his domain, Rousseau is once again simultaneously encroaching on his adversary’s sphere by stating his intent to take a scientific, reasoned and methodical approach that mirrors the one used by Rameau. His parenthetical note that the principles he establishes are only there as a stop-gap measure until someone has the time to make a full, in-depth study of the matter, is also a clever technique that both shows modest character and makes it hard to attack the author (since these are just theories). This will allow Rousseau to easily shift his position at a later date if the need arises and explicitly endorses continued exploration based on his work.

¹⁵⁰ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 143.

Just as Rousseau refers to Grimm, the latter mentions the former in his lengthy footnote—the perfect location for hidden directives, as we have seen—on the “infériorité du recitatif français.”¹⁵¹ This emerging pattern cements the *querelle* as a true conversation, with the frequent cross-referencing among its participants forming a dialogue that encourages multidirectional and constantly expanding—if carefully guided—readings and responses that are both unconventional in their dispersed effect and traditional in their basis in previous debates. Indeed, given the plethora of contributions, one could easily hop from one text to another in varied directions, and the incorporation of near-endless implicit references to external sources offers further paths of exploration. The manner in which this frames not only the conversation but also the very process of intellectual reflection is contained within Grimm’s allusion to Rousseau, which not only starts a dialogue but also mentions upcoming volumes of the *Encyclopédie*, asking that the reader continue his intellectual development—as well as prove his loyalty to the *philosophes*, with the reference almost constituting a sort of advertisement—and requiring up front a certain curiosity and openness of mind. Once again, such an approach breaks down some of the resistance that is bound to exist at the thought of validating a foreign form over its French equivalent. It also supports the idea of a subtext that uses manifold forms of referencing to create a multifaceted discourse for those who pay close attention.

Referring to other works or authors serves several purposes, not the least of which are discussing the proper way to engage in productive debate (especially in the early days of the discussion) and fulfilling the aims of a quarrel while retaining the best aspects of the art of conversation. For Rousseau, this begins with and builds on his call for respect of authorial intent.

¹⁵¹ Grimm, *Lettre sur Omphale*, in *QB*, 11.

Whereas the first case of justified non-unison accompaniment in the *Lettre sur la musique française* took just part of a sentence to describe, Rousseau's second instance is apparently so complex that he begins it by quoting Diderot. This citation seems to mirror the complexity of accompaniment we sense he is about to describe, and is one of the rare occurrences in the *Lettre* of explicit naming and citing in the main body of the text. As in the other cases of implicit or explicit referencing, this adds to Rousseau's credibility and, in this instance, serves the dual purpose of aligning Rousseau with the *philosophes* and rallying the latter to his sides. The very fact that Diderot receives prominent treatment, rather than being constrained to a footnote, demonstrates a form of reverence (Rousseau's *Lettre* perhaps being a continuation of or homage to Diderot's) and seems to call out to him for some form of support. Rousseau then indicates the great utility of the quote he has chosen and proceeds to extrapolate upon it. So, he is appealing to Diderot and his colleagues to take part in the forthcoming debate, while also asking his reader to follow his own literary example. Indeed, Rousseau seems to be requesting that we treat his letter as he has read Diderot's, determine the parts that we find interesting (and admire), and use them as springboards for further discussion. Rousseau's insistence on the fact that the analysis to follow is merely his own interpretation of how Diderot's text should be read is almost comical in this light, as the lesson for his own reader is not exactly subtle:

“Quand le musicien saura son art, dit l'auteur de la *Lettre sur les sourds et les muets*, les parties d'accompagnement concourront ou à fortifier l'expression de la partie chantante, ou à ajouter de nouvelles idées que le sujet demandait, et que la partie chantante n'aura pu rendre.” Ce passage

me paraît renfermer un précepte très utile, et voici comment je pense qu'on doit l'entendre.¹⁵²

The amusing quality is not lost on Rousseau: his recommendation is a conscious illustration of the very point made by Diderot, transferred to a philosophical application. Rousseau is thus able to take a passage by Diderot concerning music and immediately implement it (by indicating he will in fact be adding his own ideas or interpretation to Diderot's text) and then returning to the musical domain for its practical application. While seemingly simple, the sentence introducing Rousseau's reading of Diderot is a concise manual for proper debating based on respect of authorial intent and a valuation of individual ideas within a communal context (the "on" of "on doit l'entendre" implying that Rousseau's interpretation is the one that will best serve the public). Once again, Rousseau's view attempts to form and inform the rest of the quarrel: although he seeks to persuade others to join his side, Rousseau also seems to be warning his reader of the importance of respecting one's sources and of properly using cross-referencing to form responses.

The *coin du roi*, to some small extent, is resistant to this notion of cross-referencing. Usually, this is because the references made by the various participants (and, it is true, more frequently by the partisans of Italian music than by their adversaries) are seen to be disingenuous, going towards the recurring theme of *ethos* and the *coin de la reine*'s lack of a solid moral grounding. Thus, Caux de Cappeval attacks false references by alluding to the cross-referencing as manufactured and ornamental: "Citations fausses, historiettes fabriquées,

¹⁵² Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 160.

monsonges hardis; tout fait arme, tout porte coup.”¹⁵³ Marin also puts into question the very format of the quarrel by underlining the custom of addressing letters to fictional women and thus drawing attention to the debate’s spurious nature.¹⁵⁴ Ozy, too, mocks this convention, going so far as to address his *Lettre sur celle de M. J.J. Rousseau citoyen de Genève* to an American.¹⁵⁵ In these latter examples, lack of *ethos* results from a breach of *decorum*: certain forms of pretense—especially of the purely fictional variety—are inappropriate in their mockery of French customs.

However, these objections are far rarer than what seems to be, for the most part, an acceptance of Rousseau’s call for cross-referencing. Even Rameau references his principal attacker by remarking that Rousseau wrote “une vaine rhétorique contre les fugues”¹⁵⁶ in his *Lettre*. He goes on to end his *Observations sur notre instinct pour la musique* with a number of quotes straight from the *Lettre sur la musique française*,¹⁵⁷ indicating his voluntary inscription in the quarrel. This also gives Rameau the opportunity to uncover a discrepancy in Rousseau’s theories in and outside of the *querelle*: based on his adversary’s *Encyclopédie* article, “Choeur,” Rameau sees an evolution in which Rousseau admits to finding French *choeurs* pleasing, thus acquiescing to harmony’s important role. Referencing therefore sometimes goes so far as to include proof from beyond the debate proper to analyze contributions in a different light, in this

¹⁵³ Caux de Cappeval, *Apologie du goût français*, in *QB*, 1558.

¹⁵⁴ Marin, *Ce qu’on dit, ce qu’on a voulu dire, lettre à Madame Folio, marchande de brochures dans la place du vieux Louvre*, in *QB*, 471. Interestingly, Marin claims his own addressee is real, though her name—Madame Folio—tends to indicate otherwise and I could locate no reference to this bookseller from the Place du Louvre anywhere other than in Marin’s letter and her supposed response. It is thus likely that Marin was emphasizing his objection to what he saw as pretense, much as Caux de Cappeval does.

¹⁵⁵ Ozy’s juxtaposition of “Rousseau Citoyen de Genève” and “Breun de Larcherie, Américain” draws an interesting parallel between the quarrel’s foreign element and the chosen format of a quarrel principally based on open letters. There seems to be an indication that Rousseau, as a foreigner, has misunderstood the French tradition of rhetorical debate or that he has ridiculed it in adapting it to the present day.

¹⁵⁶ Rameau, *Observations sur notre instinct pour la musique et sur son principe*, in *QB*, 1883.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 1884.

case revealing a sort of loss of *memoria*—and lack of *ethos*—on Rousseau’s part, visible in the contradictions between his two texts.

On a more basic level, thinkers such as Caux de Cappeval use references to other *coin du roi* texts—such as the *Justification de la Musique Française par elle-même* by Morand and Estève, which Caux de Cappeval notes “*emporte la pièce*”—¹⁵⁸ to increase the *coin*’s impact and continue the process of selection by referencing, thus reinforcing the impact of the works perceived to be of greatest import. However, the French side’s authors also engage in the more complex referencing encouraged by the other side. For instance, Jourdan writes “... j’aimerais presque autant être condamné à lire un *in folio* d’un Baron Allemand,”¹⁵⁹ clearly admonishing Grimm (one of the quarrel’s two barons, along with Holbach) but also acknowledging his participation in the quarrel and responding to it. Castel also endorses referencing by indicating that the authors of anonymous works are in fact known—that this is a common, accepted practice, rather than a disingenuous one—, and by making himself known as the author of his *Réponse critique d’un académicien de Rouen* through his detailed analyses that closely relate to his theories surrounding his *clavecin oculaire*. In a more subtle stylistic choice that also contributes to this form of cross-referencing, Castel employs a technique of reversal, taking the opposite side’s approach and then using its argument to his favor. He does so in a way most reminiscent of Rousseau, delicately indicating to the closest of readers that the partisans of French music are aware of their main opponent’s methods and can also perform such acrobatics

¹⁵⁸ Caux de Cappeval, *Apologie du goût français*, in *QB*, 1556.

¹⁵⁹ Jourdan, *Seconde Lettre du correcteur des bouffons*, in *QB*, 570.

“par une inverse de raisonnement.”¹⁶⁰ Castel goes on to indicate that the French have the “vrai” while the Italians possess “le beau.” Through this reasoning, and based on his previous *Lettre*, both *coins* have all three qualities needed (“le vrai, le bon et le beau”)¹⁶¹ but each nation is shown to favor one over the other two. The proper order dictates “le vrai” is the most important, putting into action the promised reversal of Rousseau’s order. This coded reading alludes to the aforementioned “renversement” and the use of Rousseau’s technique to prove the contrary of his argument. Castel is hardly the only one to reference Rousseau through the use of this technique, and others are even more explicit in their allusions. For example, Ozy notes that his points are made “En se servant de la manière de raisonner de M. Rousseau,”¹⁶² and Bonneval combines the two ideas in his indication that “je n’ai qu’à employer l’Inverse de la Dialectique dont le Sieur Rousseau s’est servi en commençant sa Lettre.”¹⁶³ Others still take a hybrid approach of explicitness and transformative analysis. Aubert, for instance, closes his *Réfutation suivie et détaillée des principes de M. Rousseau* with an adaptation of Rousseau’s own famous conclusion:

Je crois avoir fait voir qu’il y a et Mélodie et Mesure dans la Musique Française, parce que la Langue en est susceptible; que notre Harmonie n’est point brute, qu’elle a de l’expression; que les airs Français sont des airs; que le Récitatif Français est un Récitatif; d’où je conclus que les

¹⁶⁰ Castel, *Lettres d’un académicien de Bordeaux sur le fonds de la musique*, in *QB*, 1421. This implicit reference to Rousseau could in fact not be more unambiguous, given our earlier examination of the terminology used here.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁶² Ozy, *Lettre sur celle de M. J.J. Rousseau*, in *QB*, 877.

¹⁶³ Bonneval, *Apologie de la musique et des musiciens français, contre les assertions peu mélodieuses, peu mesurées et mal fondées du Sieur Jean-Jacques Rousseau, ci-devant citoyen de Genève*, in *QB*, 1469.

Français ont une Musique, et une Musique excellente, qui n'aura jamais de défauts essentiels que dans vos mains.¹⁶⁴

This parody is both satirical in its reference to the ridiculousness of Rousseau's original argument and very serious in its defense of French music. It uses Rousseau's thought process and wording in an attempt to demonstrate that the text's stated goal of refutation has been achieved, which is both a rejection of Rousseau's claims and acceptance of his format. These exchanges are the ultimate form of conversational responses, taking into account the work of their own side and amplifying it, while also building on their adversary's claims and contradicting them point by point.

Not dissimilarly, Laugier repeatedly uses the word "Censeur" in his *Apologie de la musique française* to describe Rousseau, as the latter had himself done, in order to define him as a technician who misses the big picture. This is emphasized with the addition of the adjective "ingénieux" and the depiction of Rousseau failing to find anything positive in French music, which is by implication a failure on his own part, prompting the reader to think back to the second section of Laugier's *Apologie*, which demonstrated the all-important position of *ingenium*—as well as its concurrent uselessness without *judicium*. As such, Laugier uses the word "ingénieux" to elicit the reader's *memoria*, thereby creating a form of referencing both to the reader and internal to his own text. The importance of referencing not only in establishing a dialogue but also as a tool for rhetorical and theoretical growth based on reciprocity can be seen in the numerous instances of such self-referencing. Beyond Laugier's, Fréron inserts a comical

¹⁶⁴ Aubert, *Réfutation suivie et détaillée des principes de M. Rousseau de Genève, touchant la musique française. Adressée à lui-même, en réponse à sa Lettre*, in *QB*, 2020.

footnote in one of his letters—“*Cette Lettre n’est point de M. Fréron*”—¹⁶⁵ that seems to indicate precisely the reverse of what is stated, calling attention to named sources and the importance of taking responsibility for one’s writings. Castel goes farther by making fun of his own reasoning rather convincingly, by addressing himself: “Vous tirez notre Musique du fonds de nos Arts, nos Arts du fonds de notre caractère national, et notre caractère national du fonds meme de notre Histoire, déduite elle-même de celle de l’humanité depuis Adam. Voilà bien des fonds en effet.”¹⁶⁶ One might wonder whether Castel’s remarks are intended to reveal the fake or ridiculous nature of such references, but their goal is quite the contrary. The seriousness of the commentary and its use by many others confirms the extent to which the practice has become engrained in the debate. Although this is a way of countering objections from his detractors—Castel later goes on to reveal the respondent is actually a supporter and that “Il y a réellement du fonds dans vos Lettres”—¹⁶⁷ it also shows the necessity of a conversation between the texts that goes beyond just presenting theories. Thus, Ozy keeps the satirical nature of his *Lettre sur celle de M. J.J. Rousseau* in effect until the very end. He uses the fictional “M. ***” who hosted a reading of Rousseau’s letter to convey his true beliefs but nevertheless portrays himself as a staunch supporter of Rousseau until the last page (whereas many others allow for a more overt disavowal of their fabricated support). In this brand of treatise that never breaks character, the text is a sort of modern version of Le Cerf de la Viéville’s *Comparaison de la musique française et de la musique italienne* (which presents three dialogues that never deviate from their chosen form in their defense of French music against Ragueneau’s opposite viewpoint). This generates a

¹⁶⁵ Fréron or Ozy, *Lettre de Jean-Jacques Baudinet, citoyen de Gonesse, à maitre Nicolas, magister de Chaillot*, in *QB*, 1040.

¹⁶⁶ Castel, *Réponse critique d’un académicien de Rouen*, in *QB*, 1445.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 1475.

reference to the earlier debate on Italian and French music, and identifies the *coin du roi*'s position as a continuation of the French side's grand tradition of such *dialogues*.¹⁶⁸

The thinkers also treat their own works as they do those of others, building on their own previous ideas while bringing to light passages they believe are key, thus directing respondents to these. For example, Caux de Cappeval writes that “L'épreuve que vous en faites, vous sert de **préservatif contre** de plus grands malheurs,”¹⁶⁹ which refers to the author's own previous poem, “L'Antiscura,” written during the quarrel's first phase and bearing the subtitle “Préservatif contre les bouffonistes italiens.” This is Caux de Cappeval's way of indicating he has already issued a warning and that it needs to be heeded to prevent any further degradation of French *goût*. He similarly uses referencing—both to Rousseau and to his own work—to build on the centrality of *ethos* for the *coin du roi*. By failing to abide by the rules of *decorum*, Rousseau creates a morally-poor battle and opens himself up to ridicule: “L'esprit de *Chevalerie* ou de *Philosophie*, (car je n'y vois aujourd'hui nulle difference,) est ce qui domine...”¹⁷⁰ Used in this manner, the term “Chevalerie” seems to be synonymous with *clownerie* or the idea of being *bouffon*. It is a reference to the *chevaliers* of medieval times, which is to say an undesirable regression to the dark ages, amplified by Rousseau's lack of proper *decorum* in addressing women. Thanks to this, Caux de Cappeval also creates a reference to the earlier passage in this very work that mentioned

¹⁶⁸ The possibility of an inscription in this subset of rhetorical debates—and in a form that owes its existence to ancient Greece—is not lost on the participants. D'Alembert even goes so far as to reference the previous quarrel of Italian and French music by mentioning Raguenet—who was Le Cerf de la Viéville's interlocutor—in *De la Liberté de la musique*, in *QB*, 2212.

¹⁶⁹ Caux de Cappeval, *Apologie du goût français*, in *QB*, 1569 (my emphasis).

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 1571.

Don Quixote¹⁷¹ and thus helps elucidate the comparison. The author even goes on to expand on the idea by describing Don Quixote's gradual descent into insanity and noting that "chacun tombe sur le pauvre *Quichote*; chacun lui porte son coup."¹⁷² Rousseau is unmistakably the incarnation of Don Quixote, the poor victim of his own errors, unbeknownst to himself, and this literary framing is a way of once again discrediting Rousseau using the thinker's own techniques. As an added element of referencing, "*Quichote*" is italicized, creating an explicit link to all of Rousseau's direct citations, which receive the same treatment throughout the text. Such literary aspects are further amplified with Caux de Cappeval's closing quote: "*Le masque tombe, l'homme reste, / Et le Héros s'évanouit.*"¹⁷³ In the implied application of the verses to Rousseau, the poet suggests that once the latter is unmasked, no substance remains. This not only reintroduces the notions of central and ornamental (Caux de Cappeval having noted that Rousseau favors great impact over real content); it also creates a form of metareferencing in that this quote is from another Rousseau—the poet Jean-Baptiste Rousseau—and seems to suggest that the modern day Rousseau is no match for his eponymous forebear.

Cross-referencing through naming or allusion, citation and borrowed techniques therefore exists in both *coins*. The use of these techniques reveals flexibility on the part of the quarrelers, as well as an agreement on the debate's fundamental structures that goes beyond mere attack and defense. It is incumbent on each side to refine its choices within this common skeleton, placing greater emphasis on a particular category of eloquence or technical proof—be it in their virtuous

¹⁷¹ See Chapter 1 for more on this depiction of Rousseau as "le Quichote de Genève," which in turn echoes earlier appellations of this nature.

¹⁷² Caux de Cappeval, *Apologie du goût français*, in *QB*, 1571. As applied to Rousseau, it is tempting to see these "coups" as the revenge of the French measure beater's staff (which we saw is mocked by the *coin de la reine*), though there is not enough evidence to make such a claim.

¹⁷³ *Ibid.*

use by the *coin* or in their lack on the opposite side—in order to differentiate itself from its adversaries and make the best possible case for a given argument. All of these references, whether internal, to one’s own works, or to the contributions of other participants, are a way of guiding the readers, as well as the responses to come. They point out the central and less essential moments of the quarrel—determining the texts that matter, as well as those that do not in the process—in order to achieve a common accord on this important question, or to provide remedy for a particular point that has been overlooked or insufficiently explored. In so doing, this system of exchange through referencing begins to add a public dimension to the private level that exists in the quarrel’s subtext, educating the reading public (by increasing its *bon goût* through the witnessing of this selection process) and offering paths for continued, productive—and open—conversation.

Forming a public conversation

In penning the article on conversation for the *Encyclopédie*, D’Alembert makes two particularly interesting distinctions. The first contrasts regular “conversation” with the more elevated form of “entretien,” introducing the idea that particular attention must be paid to both style and content when addressing the public. The second distinction concerns spoken conversations, as opposed to the published variety. For all serious “*conversations imprimées*,”¹⁷⁴ D’Alembert indicates that the term “entretien” is more appropriate. The *querelle* falls somewhere in between this concept and the idea of “dialogues” (defined as “*conversations polémiques & publiques*”)¹⁷⁵—a polemical debate that assumes a written, published form. However, elements

¹⁷⁴ Diderot, *Encyclopédie*, v. 4, 165.

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

of D'Alembert's basic definition of "conversation" also apply: many of the interlocutors are familiar with one another, the range of topics discussed is wide, as we have seen, and the participants move effortlessly between topics or themes. We will therefore try to show that it is in this mixing of genres that one can see a merging of the private and the public, which can be explained as a melding of the concepts of *volonté particulière* and *volonté générale*, the former serving the latter and the latter guiding the former.

Its elaborate system of cross-referencing places the *querelle des bouffons* within the public sphere, while incorporating a subtext that maintains a connection with the private. All of these aspects are tied together by the framework furnished by eloquence and led by its musical example, which allows multiple levels of expression and reading to be incorporated, while ensuring the exchanges adhere to the same criteria of judgment on either side and positioning the public itself as the debate's judge. Although the debate is replete with unguarded, direct and sometimes personal exchanges—such as Jourdan's interpellation of the *philosophes*, "Comment, vous ne voyez pas, *Messieurs les Gens lumineux*, vous qui voyez tant de choses..."—¹⁷⁶ the quarrel's hidden subtext and use of cross-referencing also lead to a special form of communication between the various pamphleteers that favors the formation and expansion of common building blocks over diatribe. The coding and decoding that take place—framed by eloquence as transferred to the written form—yield more than just an open debate: the format is

¹⁷⁶ Jourdan, *Le Correcteur des bouffons* à l'écolier de Prague, in *QB*, 244.

uniquely suited to enable the emergence of a true public conversation.¹⁷⁷ Even the most general references from observers of the debate contribute to the notion that something can be made of this, by indicating the necessity to build on previous texts. For instance, Robinot's *Lettre d'un parisien* is described by Fréron in *L'Année littéraire*¹⁷⁸ as adding nothing new. His assessment is not much of an exaggeration and reveals the *querelle*'s high standards, which require that its contributors go beyond merely repeating the arguments of their side in order to develop real exchanges that can be presented to and engaged in by the public.

This concept begins with an extension of the cross-referencing just examined. Rousseau is influenced by a great number of earlier and contemporary thinkers but explicit naming of sources is saved for a select few in his *Lettre sur la musique française*. Just as Rousseau used Diderot as a facilitator for his analysis of accompaniment and Du Bos as a point of entry into the true origins of Italian music (as well as an indication of the origins of his aesthetic theories), he turns to Grimm to introduce the topic of duos. He notes that the duo is the musical form “la plus difficile à traiter sans sortir de l'unité de mélodie” but the reference to “l'auteur de la *Lettre sur Omphale*”¹⁷⁹ at this juncture (almost exactly midway through the letter) is significant beyond the difficulty of the topic. Once again, Rousseau uses a system of precedence to reinforce his argument—and Grimm is certainly aligned Rousseau in every main respect—but the moment is also particularly apt for a reintroduction of the idea of a quarrel in which each side builds upon

¹⁷⁷ In *Au Petit Prophète de Boehmischbroda, au grand prophète Monet; à tous ceux qui les ont précédés et suivis, et à tous ceux qui les suivront*, in *QB*, 426, Diderot invokes the anonymity used in many exchanges to claim he is not attacking anyone in particular. Clearly, quarrel participants are aware of the identities of those participating, including that of most of the anonymous pamphlets' authors, but Diderot's statement is meant to encourage debating the issues, rather than pinpointing a person for holding certain views. Thus, the *querelle* is conceived as a debate that favors the public over the personal, seeking to serve a common interest.

¹⁷⁸ Fréron, *L'Année littéraire*, v. 1, 268.

¹⁷⁹ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 163.

and interacts with previous writings. This intent is immediately visible as Rousseau describes his solution to the misused duo form:

... rien n'est moins naturel que de voir deux personnes se parler à la fois durant un certain temps, soit pour dire la même chose, soit pour se contredire, sans jamais s'écouter ni se répondre. Et quand cette supposition pourrait s'admettre en certain cas, il est bien certain que ce ne serait jamais dans la tragédie, où cette indécence n'est convenable ni à la dignité des personnages qu'on y fait parler, ni à l'éducation qu'on leur suppose. Or, le meilleur moyen de sauver cette absurdité c'est de traiter le plus qu'il est possible le duo en dialogue...¹⁸⁰

In a more sustained form than earlier, the entire passage contains a double meaning, serving to entertain the reader through humor (since the duality takes place during a discussion of the duo form), as well as address two essential points. The first, literal reading concerns the proper use of competing melodies, with Rousseau's unsurprising solution being to imitate speech patterns and, reflecting rhetorical *decorum*, adjust one's style to the appropriate genre. This satisfies the natural order of things (speech guiding music), while lending believability to the situations and maintaining the all-important concept of "unité de mélodie." The second, inferred reading is one that guides the unfolding of the *querelle*. It is strongly supported by the introduction of the passage referencing Grimm, as Rousseau illustrates how one builds on the ideas of one's side ("pour dire la même chose"). He has also just finished demonstrating a very courteous disagreement with Du Bos, who—were he still alive—would almost certainly be on his side ("pour se contredire"). The rest unfolds like a roadmap to the proper conversational style for the quarrel: the contributors being educated and well-behaved will naturally listen to each other

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*

fully, and respond accordingly. Rousseau is unusually restrained in this passage of the letter, demonstrating that he can be measured and reasonable when necessary. However, listening to the other side does not imply attenuating one's own arguments. Thus, Rousseau is not calling for muted discourse but rather alternating, full-force responses to the opposing side: a real dialogue based on the long history of French conversation¹⁸¹ and inherited from ancient Greek models. This confirms the quarrel as using the mode of ancient dialogues (as we saw D'Alembert recommends in his *Encyclopédie* article) to create necessary conflict, without which arriving at the truth is not possible on the grand scale (a dialogue incorporating many interlocutors necessitating strong dualities in order to align all the participants and avoid so great a multiplicity that no conclusions can be drawn). Rather than reaching a consensus, one side will emerge victorious. However, the emphasis is placed squarely on the importance of reception—of listening to the other side—, which calls for the *querelle* to be both a confrontational debate and a conversation in which participants truly listen to each other. It is thanks to the incorporation of this conversational dimension into the quarrel that the winner's victory will be ethical. One can read the continuation of Rousseau's text in this manner:

... et ce premier soin regarde le poète; ce qui regarde le musicien c'est de trouver un chant convenable au sujet et distribué de telle sorte que chacun des interlocuteurs parlant alternativement, toute la suite du dialogue ne forme qu'une mélodie...¹⁸²

¹⁸¹ See Fumaroli, "La Conversation," 678-743. For Fumaroli, the particularity of the French, and especially Parisian, traditions of conversation—traced back to ancient Athens and led by "ses "stars" masculines ou féminines, nobles ou roturières" (688)—is favorable to the type of debate fostered by the quarrel. The latter is still very much led by the nobility and literati but it builds on the participation of the "érudits Parisiens" and their "pairs provinciaux et étrangers de passages" (692) that began in the previous century and exists alongside the *salons*, contributing to the "version mondaine" (694) of exchange that allows French conversation to become the model for Europe.

¹⁸² Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 163.

Given the subtext, Rousseau's reminder of the appropriate division of labor creates a reference for the reader to his earlier indication that musicians create music and poets create poetry but the *philosophes* are the ones qualified to discuss both. At the same time, continuity is advocated ("toute la suite du dialogue ne forme qu'une mélodie"), both confirming melody's supremacy and supporting the idea that each contributor must await his turn to speak. Rousseau goes on to perform a technical analysis of exactly how duos should work (for instance, "il faut trouver un chant susceptible d'une marche par tierces ou par sixtes dans lequel la seconde partie fasse son effet sans distraire l'oreille de la première" in the rare cases where two parts truly need to be simultaneous), demonstrating his technical knowledge and confirming the idea that he has jurisdiction over such reasoned discussion (and, by implication, that Rameau does not). In this context, "unité de mélodie" could be seen as a reminder that each side of the debate must not quibble over details and should unite behind its main ideas. Similarly, Rousseau's description of "la durezza des dissonances" and "le fortissimo de l'orchestre" that convey their message "dans l'âme de tout spectateur sensible, et lui font éprouver le pouvoir de l'harmonie sobrement ménagée"¹⁸³ is a call for the use of accessory techniques represented by harmony—in support of guiding principles, as embodied by melody—only when these are absolutely necessary, in order to retain the impact of such moments and preserve the overarching visions. He confirms this by noting that "ces instants doivent être rares et amenés avec art" and they are to be preceded by a soft, seductive music that has "déjà disposé l'oreille et le cœur à l'émotion."¹⁸⁴ Rousseau's musical system is therefore unmistakably derived from rhetorical precepts, to which he adds his own version of moderation—concluding the passage by noting that "ce qui est au-delà de la

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, 164.

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid.*

nature ne touche plus”—¹⁸⁵ based more on his revulsion towards artificiality than the classical notion of reasoned restraint. The importance of this debate being primarily intellectual, and thus forming an intelligent conversation among its participants is apparent in the idea that the *oreille*, not just the *cœur*, is vital for both forms: used in this context, the notion promotes not simply an ability to hear and detect good music but also to understand it fully in all its subtleties (that is, to really listen), just as one must pay close attention to an oral or written discourse (i.e., Rousseau’s own *Lettre*). Rousseau is encouraging not merely vigorous but also thoughtful, profound debate that brings conversation into the public realm through both the challenges it issues to the reader, and its moral and educational responsibilities.

It is precisely on this point that the *coin du roi* redoubles its attacks. For instance, Travenol questions the quality and appropriateness of Rousseau’s contributions, indicating they are not fit for this type of public debate: “comment ose-t-il débiter publiquement de pareilles singularités...?”¹⁸⁶ Aubert further notes that the *coin de la reine* seems proud that no one has been able to seriously refute Rousseau’s letter and that, instead, personal attacks abound. Rather than proving the French side’s inabilities, for Aubert this is evidence of the letter’s lack of substance, and he concludes that “J’aurais été étonné qu’aucun d’eux eut analysé sérieusement des sophismes...”¹⁸⁷ The frequent use of the term “sophisme”—which Aubert later groups under the umbrella of “faux moyens,” with the enumeration “sophismes, faux arguments, contradictions palpables,”¹⁸⁸ revealing Rousseau’s morally-dubious nature—is an attack on the

¹⁸⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁸⁶ Travenol, *Arrêt du conseil d’état d’Apollon*, in *QB*, 896.

¹⁸⁷ Aubert, *Réfutation suivie et détaillée des principes de M. Rousseau de Genève, touchant la musique française. Adressée à lui-même, en réponse à sa Lettre*, in *QB*, 1925.

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 1928.

author's character but it also reflects a perceived lack of depth—or at least of complexity—in Rousseau's arguments. This in turn leads to an inability to have a true conversation because it stifles the possibility of serious analyses in response to Rousseau's texts. It is along these lines that Laugier uses a long list of possible solutions in the closing pages of his *Apologie de la musique française*¹⁸⁹ as a mechanism to underscore the lack of any real solution in the *Lettre sur la musique française*. This is a clever way of conversing with Rousseau—without entering into the game of trying to disprove him—and asking his opponent to back up his criticisms with some constructive solutions (using the most basic definition of conversation and conveniently ignoring the fact that this is a quarrel and that consensus is therefore not the goal). Similarly, Caux de Cappeval uses humor—stating that “Mallebranche voyait tout en Dieu: *Jean Jacques* voit tout en lui-même...”¹⁹⁰ to oppose personal and collective good, the implication being that the *querelle*'s public nature entails a responsibility towards its said public, a positioning of *volonté générale* above *volonté particulière*.

The very notion of the need to build on previous texts, repeatedly put forward by Rousseau, is used against its originator. The author is thus often criticized for repeating old arguments without adding anything of value. For instance, Fréron denies Rousseau's claim of originality by indicating that the arguments contained in his *Lettre* had been made well before its publication. He cites the Père André's *Essai sur le Beau*, which did indeed clearly influence Rousseau, as we noted previously. He also indicates that the rule of unity which forms the omphalos of Rousseau's musical theories finds its roots all the way back in ancient Rome and, specifically, in Seneca's works: “Voyez-vous, dit-il [Sénèque], cette multitude de voix qui

¹⁸⁹ Laugier, *Apologie de la musique française*, in *QB*, 1222-1226.

¹⁹⁰ Caux de Cappeval, *Apologie du goût français, relativement à l'opéra*, in *QB*, 1563.

composent nos grands Choeurs de Musique? Elles se joignent toutes si parfaitement, qu'il semble qu'elles ne rendent à l'oreille qu'un seul et unique son."¹⁹¹ André further cites Batteux (a future *académicien* critiqued by Diderot and known for aesthetic theories based on the precepts of French classicism, including *bon goût* and the imitation of the *beau*) and his *Beaux arts réduits à un même principe*, from 1746, as providing fodder for this prolific pillager. Even Rousseau's criticisms of French music are said to be plundered from previous thinkers, and Fréron uses l'Abbé Desfontaines and Voltaire's *Le siècle de Louis XIV* as proof of their lack of validity, the latter summing up and refuting the arguments made so lengthy by Rousseau.¹⁹² So, a serious lack of originality is perceived and the *Lettre sur la musique française* can consequently be characterized as devoid of any real content. It fails to integrate itself into a conversation that requires its exchanges to build on each other and offer original ideas.

The need for close listening described by Rousseau and D'Alembert, among others, also helps determine whether participants are properly integrating their works into the written conversation. Thus, when Aubert refutes the notion of bad music being due to the French language's inability to be musical by declaring *all* languages to be musical (French immusicality therefor being false), the flaw lies not in the language but in a lack of good listening: it is the listener's own fault if he does not locate the musicality that exists. As we have noted, the *coin de la reine* invokes a very similar need for close listening, also based on varying levels. However, D'Alembert uses a novel approach by finding fault with the Italian music that the other side *does* find appealing, revealing French listening standards to be based on habit: those who falsely claim

¹⁹¹ Fréron, *Lettres sur la Musique Française*, in *QB*, 819.

¹⁹² *Ibid.*, 825.

to appreciate Italian music (that is, those who have “des oreilles hypocrites”)¹⁹³ can be identified based on the Italian airs they prefer, which are the worst ones (which is to say, the most French).¹⁹⁴ True listeners are “Gens de Lettres” and “Artistes,”¹⁹⁵ all of whom have rallied around Italian music, and who D’Alembert points out overwhelmingly despise French opera. This reveals those who really possess good taste and the concordant necessity to be good readers or listeners, which entails playing an active role. Similarly, it is poor listeners who are to blame for bad music: “Au reste, c’est encore moins nos Musiciens qu’il faut accuser de cette indigence, que leurs auditeurs.”¹⁹⁶ Laziness spells the end of eloquence, as seen in public’s choices: “Chez la plupart de Français, la Musique qu’ils appellent *chantante*, n’est autre chose que la Musique commune, dont ils ont eu cent fois les oreilles rebattues; pour eux un mauvais air est celui qu’ils ne peuvent fredonner, et un mauvais Opéra, celui dont ils ne peuvent rien retenir.”¹⁹⁷ The facility of habit—rather than a cultural education, as the *coin du roi* would have us believe—is the source of the French partisans’ choices, and it is evident that reflection and active participation on the part of readers and listeners alike are the missing ingredients. All of these thoughts are part of a broader consideration of the reader’s (or listener’s) role and, within the context of the quarrel, participation through active reading—and, in the case of the contributors, using the information gleaned to build better responses—helps form the conversation’s public dimension.

¹⁹³ D’Alembert, *De la Liberté de la musique*, in *QB*, 2263.

¹⁹⁴ This also underlines two conflicting aims: pleasing one’s audience, while being able to evolve and change. The former is not as crucial as the latter, since it can be achieved through persuasion.

¹⁹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 2264.

¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.*

In his *Réflexions sur la musique*, D'Alembert likewise concedes that the French take sincere pleasure in their music and wonders how this is even possible.¹⁹⁸ The answer is once again habit: they have become so used to their language's sounds that their music is thus pleasing to their ears—a sort of pleasure in observing the *status quo* that reveals a lack of objectivity due to the very act of cultural acclimation so prized by the *coin du roi*.¹⁹⁹ In a sense, D'Alembert sees French composers as having adapted too well to their audience, to the point of being subsumed by the latter. This means that the French side no longer fulfills its goal of educating, and is also defeated from a rhetorical perspective, since the orator should never be the one to be persuaded by his interlocutors. For D'Alembert, French music is suited to the French ear²⁰⁰ and it is unclear whether the music itself or the ear is to blame for this sad fact. According to the line of reasoning charted in *De la Liberté de la musique*, the musician would be to blame, which goes towards the loss of the education principle, yet the call for careful listening also places a certain amount of responsibility with the public. This necessity of active reading and listening demanded by D'Alembert and Rousseau allows for a true conversation, which is more inclusionary than the French model, since it privileges close reading and an education in letters, rather than a cultural upbringing available solely in France. In this form of public conversation, even those who are silent can actively respond through the act of careful consumption and, eventually, by taking on

¹⁹⁸ D'Alembert, *Réflexions sur la musique*, in *QB*, 1662.

¹⁹⁹ Laugier realizes that innovative approaches must also accept common preconceptions in order to appeal and to avoid being completely foreign. This combination of theory and common foundations is precisely what allows for a conversation and explains why in Part III of his *Apologie de la musique française*, Laugier suddenly takes a highly-traditional approach, attacking Italian music as extreme and seeking only the singular, as so many before him have done.

²⁰⁰ D'Alembert, *Réflexions sur la musique*, in *QB*, 1666.

the important role of judge—an active role born out of music’s ability to persuade—in the choice one side or the other.

Thus, both *coins* call for an element of close reading and listening as part of achieving a successful conversation. Bonneval describes Rousseau as assaulting the French side while simultaneously refusing to listen to its responses, an offense that affects both Rousseau’s own contributions and the debate’s unfolding. He does this by telling the story of a great General who is threatened by “un étourdi; ce grand homme lui répondit froidement: Frappe... Mais, Ecoute. Non seulement le Sieur Rousseau a frappé, mais il a ajouté, qu’également insensible aux satyres et aux éloges, il n’écouterait rien.”²⁰¹ Rousseau compounds his error by using brute force but, more important, he does not listen (deeming his opponents’ responses to consist of “satyres et... éloges” and thus unworthy of his attention). What most bothers Bonneval is that Rousseau actively refuses to listen, by choice—a recurring point of criticism from his opponents, the implication that one must first listen in order to determine the quality of a response. In likely referencing Rousseau’s remark alluded to earlier that he will not be found in attendance at performances of French operas (another meaning for the statement that “il n’écouterait rien”), Bonneval links his opponent’s argumentative deficiencies to his musical ones. The depiction of a physical assault conveys the sense of excessive argumentation that goes beyond eloquence and breaks away from the norms of even the most vigorous conversation, while beginning with a story is a reflection of earlier texts from the *coin de la reine* that use this technique. The latter helps form a conversation through an agreement on methodology and a respect for structural elements from the other side that are seen as effective.

²⁰¹ Bonneval, *Apologie de la musique et des musiciens français*, in *QB*, 1065.

In constructing this conversation, many *coin du roi* thinkers directly respond to their opponents in some detail. For instance, in a relatively open response to Rousseau, Travenol enjoys pointing out the ridiculousness of the example of the *Arménien de Venise*. He cleverly retorts with *deux Chinois* who exactly mirror the Armenian's reaction—only in reverse, favoring French style. Beyond the amusing aspect of Travenol's anecdote, a real response is built through satire. What was ridiculous—but also appealing and exotic—becomes doubly so in every respect: the Chinese are about twice as exotic, and doubled in number, as compared to Rousseau's Armenian. There is therefore a concurrent desire to show just how unreasonable and egregious the other side has been, while also seeking to outdo it at its own game. So, ridicule can be more than mockery, incarnating a strange form of respect and producing an exchange in which responses build on each other. It is this type of conversation that holds the public responsible for a form of active reading, and the high standards it sets for itself become apparent in the level of detail that is incorporated. Similarly, a reader unfamiliar with Rousseau's letter would not understand many of Caux de Cappeval's references, revealing once again that the format of a conversation with direct responses can be as overt or as dissimulated as each contributor desires, and the attentive reader is rewarded for his efforts. Thus, in the statement “Ils n'ont pas de *Bucheron*; mais leurs pieds en font l'office,”²⁰² the informed reader knows that “*Bucheron*” refers to Grimm's term for the leader beating his stick—as it is reused by Rousseau. Invoking the notion of collective *memoria* we examined earlier creates a sort of participation on the part of those who do not contribute texts but are nevertheless active in their reading. It also underlines the fact that if the French are at fault for their beating of the measure, the Italians once

²⁰² Caux de Cappeval, *Apologie du goût français, relativement à l'opéra*, in *QB*, 1564.

again lack any sort of *decorum* in their excessive, disorderly and unbecoming equivalent of mass foot stomping. Although authors like Caux de Cappeval satirize and ridicule Rousseau, in such instances they also show respect for eloquence through public conversation and thusly for Rousseau's notion of authorial intent. Accepting the quarrel's form in this context is reminiscent of the preconceptions examined in Chapter 1—ensuring that both sides share common values and expectations—and allows for a full focus on content that grows based on previous contributions.

So, this progression based on a conversation that crosses over from one *coin* to the other can be intricate, and goes beyond just referencing. This can further be seen in Diderot's illustration of these sometimes-complex correspondences in *Les Trois Chapitres*. A form of conversation comes to light in Diderot's opening: "Et la nuit du mardi-gras..."²⁰³ The author begins in the middle of a sentence and of his story, which seems innocuous enough. However, the close reader instantly recalls that Mairobert's *Les Prophéties du grand prophète Monet* began with "Et j'étais dans mon appartement..."²⁰⁴ which in turn referenced Grimm's original "Et j'étais dans mon grenier que j'appelle ma chambre..."²⁰⁵ In including extremely similar stylistic elements from the very opening of their texts, the three authors create a set of common expectations from their reader who also explicitly understands he must seek out correspondences between the works (and perhaps more generally in the quarrel's pamphlets). Published in between Grimm and Mairobert's texts, Jourdan's *Le Correcteur des bouffons* does not directly take part in this conversation. Instead, his text is mirrored by his own second contribution,

²⁰³ Diderot, *Les Trois Chapitres*, in *QB*, 493.

²⁰⁴ Mairobert, *Le Prophéties du grand prophète Monet*, in *QB*, 303.

²⁰⁵ Grimm, *Le Petit Prophète de Boehmischbroda*, in *QB*, 135.

Seconde Lettre du Correcteur des bouffons, which happens to reference the first by using a mirrored opening (“Mon cher petit Écolier...”²⁰⁶ versus “Vous avez lu sans doute, mon cher petit Écolier...”²⁰⁷ in the first text), which is a way of indicating the author is conscious of the other contributors’ stylistic mirroring (the *Seconde Lettre* being written after the other pamphlets, in May 1753). Jourdan’s two letters also very clearly respect Grimm’s style, responding in kind while creating reversals and expansions. For his part, Mairobert features a character that is almost an exact reversal of Grimm’s (whereas Grimm’s hero is poor, Mairobert’s is rich, whereas the first lives in a tiny attic, the second enjoys a luxurious apartment, and so forth), a common technique of satire but also a way of indicating the two *coins*’ worldviews are exact opposites. This simplistic approach of uninventive reversal (with interpellations such as “O, Académie Royale de Musique, car tu en es une...”²⁰⁸ that, again, form an exact counterpoint to Grimm’s statements) is perceived as a failed response by Diderot, inciting the *philosophe* to write a successful response that properly uses referencing—a sort of corrected version of what Mairobert intended that truly respects Grimm’s authorial intent. By integrating Mairobert (and, of course, Grimm) into his text in this fashion and showing how replies can remain faithful to their inspiration while innovating and contributing additional content, Diderot provides a roadmap to using previous works as part of an open yet intricate discussion. The latter should be engaging, require familiarity with the canon of texts that preceded and go beyond the other contributions in some fashion, so as to provide a point of continuation. For Diderot, it is in this last respect that Mairobert fails.

²⁰⁶ Jourdan, *Seconde Lettre du Correcteur des Bouffons à l’écolier de Prague*, in *QB*, 567.

²⁰⁷ Jourdan, *Le Correcteur des bouffons à l’écolier de Prague*, in *QB*, 195.

²⁰⁸ Mairobert, *Les Prophéties du grand prophète Monet*, in *QB*, 311.

From this perspective, the *querelle des bouffons* is a massive, public extension of conversation that maintains the ethical characteristics of eloquence hidden within its aesthetic themes. Indeed, for Rousseau—despite what his adversaries claim in their attacks—, music’s essence is moral. This explains the choice of music: it is a topic perfectly suited to safeguarding eloquence while engaging in this form of collective conversation that is interested in allowing *volonté particulière* to advance *volonté générale*, thus finding universal truths.²⁰⁹ There is a belief in the *coin de la reine* that violent exchanges can be beneficial to this goal, since true eloquence can withstand attacks—as long as they are morally-based—and only poorly-founded argumentation will be damaged in the end.

On either side, the use of references to go beyond citation and create an open conversation that relies on true reciprocity seems to be born from this quest for truth. For instance, Castel repeatedly cites the epigraph from Rousseau’s *Lettre* (“*Sunt verba et voces, praeterea nihil.*”) in his own *Lettres d’un académicien de Bordeaux* but does so in a manner that goes beyond a simple mirroring of Rousseau’s use of the quote. In addition to creating a parallelism, Castel uses the citation as a way of conversing, noting that “... puisque son intention est dans ce Vers que je lui rends avec plaisir. *Sunt verba et voces, praeterea nihil.*”²¹⁰ Granted, the conversation is somewhat impolite but it matches perfectly with the nature of the quarrel—the quote being thrown back at Rousseau much like a handkerchief at the inception of a

²⁰⁹ Along these lines, in *Lettre d’un symphoniste de l’académie royale de musique*, in *QB*, 654 (before he wrote his *Second Discours* on inequality in 1754 and close to a decade prior to the publication of the 1762 *Du Contrat social*, in which he outlines *volonté générale* as a self-motivated way of ensuring civic rights—for instance, we support “l’égalité de droit,” Book 2, Chapter 4, in *Œuvres*, v. 1, 650, because it benefits us), Rousseau defends the notion of “vrais Citoyens” that are “gens de goût” who abide by the moral principles of eloquence, and are willing and able to defend the better side of the argument (i.e. support Italian music) without fear or prejudice.

²¹⁰ Castel, *Lettres d’un académicien de Bordeaux sur le fonds de la musique*, in *QB*, 1403. See pp. 1377 and 1412 for two other examples of the author’s citing of Rousseau’s epigraph.

duel—, both abiding by the debate’s format and emphasizing the notion that there is back and forth that resembles oral exchanges, transferred to the written form through its complex incorporation of referential and stylistic elements and made grand enough to befit the public nature of this conversation. This sort of written, public eloquence allows participants to show off their skills without being inappropriate, while clearly positioning the reading public as its judge.²¹¹ In order to achieve this ideal, open-mindedness is seen as necessary by both *coins*. Whether or not it is genuine, participants from the two sides repeatedly declare their willingness—and even their eagerness—to listen to all points of view and to admit when they are wrong. For instance, Jourdan declares that “je vais essayer de vous rendre compte des motifs qui m’ont déterminé, et que je suis prêt d’abandonner, si l’on me prouve que j’ai tort.”²¹² The aforementioned quest for universal truth thus begins with a simple and general desire to be truthful. The main participants favor either apodictic (which is to say a quest for the true nature of each question) or epideictic discourse (in offering the opportunity for a contrasting through praise and blame of each argument’s confutation and each side’s respective merits) precisely because of their basis in *ethos* and consequent demonstrability (whether in the scientific aspect of

²¹¹ The position of the public as judge is a recurring theme, both implicitly and explicitly. See, for instance, Caux de Cappeval, *Apologie du goût français, relativement à l’opéra*, in *QB*, 1553, or Rochemont, who cites “le Public Français” as the ultimate judge in *Réflexions d’un patriote sur l’opéra français et sur l’opéra italien*, in *QB*, 2115. Rare exceptions to this view of the public come from the *coin du roi* and are usually depictions not so much of the quarrel’s readers as of the supporters of Italian music. Thus, Fréron notes, in *Lettres sur la musique française*, in *QB*, 767, that “Le grand argument en faveur de cette Musique, c’est qu’elle est reçue dans toute l’Europe, et hautement préférée à la nôtre... Mais ces memes Peuples mettent notre Théâtre fort au-dessous du leur... Peut-on cependant nous refuser la palme dans le genre dramatique?” The notion that public judgment can be flawed is more a reflection of poor taste imported from beyond French borders—once again questioning things foreign—and the easy appeal of Italian music, than an attack on the careful, educated French reader. For Fréron, Italian music has so permeated the culture that the only way to be unbiased is to support French music, which leads him to call those in the *coin du roi* “les Anti-Bouffonistes, ou plutôt les Spectateurs neutres” (*Ibid.*, 770)—but, above all, this is a response to what he terms Rousseau’s “soldatesque” (*Ibid.*, 771) letter. So, most such depictions have to do with fighting those perceived as excessive on the other side, rather than attacking the reading public as a whole.

²¹² Jourdan, *Lettre critique et historique sur la musique française*, in *QB*, 453.

the apodictic or the balance achieved through epideictic exchanges) that allows the public to fairly and accurately choose a side.

Because of the debate's nature as a public, written conversation, the thinkers are also conscious of the need to entertain and provide delivery that keeps the reader interested. Thus, good *actio* in its written form cannot be completely discarded and many supporters of French music are conscious that the other side's great agility in this part of eloquence influences the readers. Parisot refers to a Horace maxim (*ridiculum acri fortius ac melius magnas plerumque secant res*)²¹³ to emphasize the point. This may be yet another reason music is perfectly suited to the quarrel, the importance of *delectare* never being far removed from its other goals, even if certain evolved theories give it grander ambitions. The notion is born from the conception of eloquence as music, which justifies favoring less reason and greater simplicity through a theoretical leap: in such discourse inspired by music—from the heart, not the mind—, eloquence (like music) must move and reach the audience above all else, without getting caught up in dry demonstrations. (In fact, this last point is one of the essential tenets of D'Alembert definition of conversation, which is bound “de n'y point avoir le ton dogmatique et magistral,”²¹⁴ revealing the importance of this type of eloquence in its elaboration.) Parisot ends his text by calling for this sort of sublime—the “sublime bon mot” from his title, constituted of *épigramme*, *ironie*, *invective*, ... (as enumerated in the subtitle). Ironic in its criticism of certain baseless attacks, the

²¹³ “Ridicule often settles matters of importance better and with more effect than severity” (trans. *Routledge Dictionary of Quotations*, ed. Jon Stone, 105), as quoted in Latin by Parisot in *L'Apologie du sublime bon mot, de l'épigramme, de l'ironie, de l'invective, des personnalités, et autres armes employées par les beaux esprits, les inspirés, les prétendus méchants, etc. dans la guerre qui s'est élevée à l'occasion des musiques italienne et française. Contre la censure d'un prétendu philosophe qui a osé proposer le projet bizarre de leur substituer des raisons*, in *QB*, 431. Parisot's long and evocative title certainly demonstrates—in its irony—the manner in which the *coin du roi* is capable of engaging in the type of discourse it often criticizes as unnecessarily violent and lacking in *decorum*.

²¹⁴ Diderot, *Encyclopédie*, v. 4, 165.

idea is nevertheless serious in the sense that the use of these techniques is clearly effective in reaching the public. The statement also seeks to weaken the *coin de la reine* in the long run, demonstrating the futility of the *philosophes*' enterprise and the inevitable pettiness of quarrels. The justification of less reason is therefore based on logical deductions of the type Rousseau might attempt, and there is some sincerity even on the French side in calling for texts that engage the reader—or, at the very least, a recognition of their efficacy within this conversation created for and judged by the public.

The quarrel's written format is crucial in achieving this goal, perhaps counter-intuitively in that traditional oratory would more readily charm and entertain the general public. However, the written form, in stripping away the most immediate responses, elevates the discourse and allows for various types of discussions to take place in between the exchanges, thus resulting in a greater participation both in terms of actual discussion and of the variety of contributions. It also enables a multitude of levels of eloquence and literary devices, such as the use of footnotes and cross-references. Thus, even though many pamphlets are presented as letters, the *querelle* goes well beyond the epistolary form: there is more incorporation of and building on contributions from wide-ranging sources, which results in greater complexity but also more involvement on the part of pamphleteers and readers alike. The public nature of the debate fosters a particularly open conversation, with thinkers such as Castel stressing their status as “amateur[s].”²¹⁵ What is meant by this is not to be confused with a lack of education or erudition but, rather, that one need not be a professional musician to enter into this musically-themed conversation. The idea also encourages readers to take this written debate and return it to its oral form through extended

²¹⁵ Castel, *Lettres d'un académicien de Bordeaux sur le fonds de la musique*, in *QB*, 1420.

conversations that eventually get integrated back into the core debate through written responses. Such explorations in *salons* and *cafés* certainly occurred and contributed to both the quarrel's far-reaching impact, as well as its quest for universal truths. The latter is a necessity and brings with it the task of serious analysis that goes hand in hand with the debate's eloquent framing: as summed up by Travenol, an ideal participant “se livre aisément au plaisir de louer, et qu'il ne cede qu'avec peine à la nécessité de critiquer.”²¹⁶ The importance of understanding the impact of the quarrel's texts and the necessity of looking at both sides with an analytical eye leads to the incorporation of *éloge* and *blâme*, in the tradition of epideictic discourse but fully adapted to the *querelle*'s specificities. Thus, this desire for reflection—whether or not philosophical—includes a clear understanding of the need for critical distance. The contributors agree that the format is that of a written conversation, and thinkers such as Travenol are marked by the strangeness of this concept, in which one responds by speaking to one's self (internally prior to one's contributions, and externally in the act of writing) in order to address the other (but without the benefit of being directly faced with one's adversary, as in traditional oratory).

It becomes increasingly clear that eloquence is perceived as worth saving for both *coins*, leading to agreements that might otherwise not be possible. Along these lines, Cazotte shows his appreciation for Italian music's power, even if it is perceived as negative by his side. In so doing, he enters into an interesting analysis of the notion of “corps” as a complex sociopolitical entity: “les *connaisseurs* se déclarent pour elle [la nouvelle musique]. Ceux qui veulent passer pour l'être, les suivirent à ce spectacle avec les curieux, les oisifs, et le corps de la nation.”²¹⁷ In this

²¹⁶ Travenol, *La Galerie de l'académie royale de musique*, in *QB*, 1537.

²¹⁷ Cazotte, *La Guerre de l'opéra: lettre écrite à une dame en province par quelqu'un qui n'est ni d'un coin ni de l'autre*, in *QB*, 322.

context, the idea of “corps” is pejorative. The body’s head is incarnated by the *philosophes* and what remains—the “corps”—is the embodiment of people as mere sheep with no will of their own. However, Cazotte goes on to describe the performance style of an Italian soprano, noting that “Sa voix a peu de corps; elle est légère, sonore et juste.”²¹⁸ In this depiction, “corps” is an element that provides substance, while concurrently weighing down the singer: her lack of “corps” allows the performer to be light, natural, and appealing. Taken too far, this lightness is what renders Italian opera insignificant and leads commentators to describe Rousseau’s own *Devin du village* as “ce petit Acte” and, worse, “une niaiserie.”²¹⁹ Nevertheless, two sides to the concept of “corps” are depicted, reflecting an opposition between two notions of what is central. Cazotte is in effect making good—at least in appearance—on his promise to write from neither of the two *coins* through his analysis of the way in which each side views the concept differently. His comments also reflect the new society in which the public should be the judge—for him, replacing the elite of *philosophes* and other cognoscenti. According to Cazotte, this is the ideal state the quarrel must hope to reach, indicating yet again that the public’s role has evolved and is vital for both *coins*.

The value of eloquence—in a form that accurately respects its essential components, as opposed to what is produced by “Tous ces Toiseurs de Vers et ces peseurs de Proses”—²²⁰ and the necessity of its defense in achieving such goals are supported by the notion that it is precisely in its relationship with eloquence that reflection on music must be framed. Conversely, it is

²¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 323.

²¹⁹ Jourdan, *Le Correcteur des bouffons*, in *QB*, 206. French *actio* is so positive for Jourdan that *Le Devin du village* and *La Serva Padrona* are referenced in a tongue-in-cheek fashion as “le devin Jeliote et la Servante Fel,” paying homage to the France’s famous leading voices.

²²⁰ Travenol, *La Galerie de l’académie royale de musique*, in *QB*, 1537.

music as a topic that provides the fodder for a defense of eloquence and a reflection on what is essential and what is not. Within this debate, the role of the public as arbiter has three main consequences: the debate is public at its very core—both in its conception and in its unfolding, much as is opera—, the principles of eloquence must continue to be taught in order for the public to be fully up to its role as judge, and the quarrel’s participants must actively deploy eloquence in seeking to persuade the Parisian public at large. Relying on the public thus has an impact on collective *memoria*, which we saw is no longer only in the author’s hands (as the *querelle*’s orator) but also in the reader’s. Indeed, the necessity of engagement, if only by reaction, means that the public is tasked with following the quarrel carefully. This in turn motivates it to better itself in order comprehend the conversation’s subtleties and thus actively fulfill its role. If *memoria* as traditionally the skill of an individual orator, in the *querelle*’s written format, it is also a phenomenon that draws on the common knowledge of both writer and reader to form a collective version of itself. The result is a concept that uses the criteria of the traditional rhetorical notion but applies them to the reader by requiring a level of sophistication and close attention not always assumed to be present in previous debates, and thereby allowing the reader to more genuinely play the role of judge. In calling on the reader to decide, as did Rousseau before him, Rameau ascribes to this third party—a public both fully engaged, yet once removed from the writing of the quarrel’s text (which could be considered the primary texts), contributing only commentary (or a form of secondary works) which are not integrated into the written conversation—the task of *judicium*. When the latter is performed, the public has been moved to act, achieving persuasion, and in so doing its private contributions to the quarrel (the non-written commentaries) become public and integrated into the quarrel through this action. This is the only

way to equitably settle the debate and it reveals a confidence in both *coins* based on the certainty that the attentive, intelligent reader will agree with the better side. In the case of Rameau, the influence of eloquence on his musicological approach could not be any clearer than in his *Observations sur notre instinct pour la musique*: in addition to alluding to *judicium*, he notes that the reader will be able to come to conclusions “sans qu’il en coûte beaucoup à l’esprit ni à la mémoire,”²²¹ directly referencing the other two faculties of the soul—*ingenium* and *memoria*—which are required of the public but are developed through the theorists, whose work it is to educate their reader as well as make comprehension sufficiently easy for him to be able to fulfill his role.

*
**

Once again, the central relationship between eloquence and music provides essential clues to understanding the debate and even the direction taken by eloquence itself. What Kintzler refers to as its “interiority”²²² plays an important role in allowing music to establish its perceived direct connection to the soul and certainly contributes to its uniqueness within the realm of the arts, but the aspect that makes music rhetorical in the most traditional sense is an almost-inverse notion—its universality (be it in the depiction of the universal notion of a storm or its ability to reproduce specific affects, for example)—and its resulting capacity to reach wide audiences. Nevertheless, it is its forceful and direct impact, linguistically-rooted for Rousseau, that allows Italian music to achieve *movere*. While this facet of music is linked to the notion of interiority in

²²¹ Rameau, *Observations sur notre instinct pour la musique et sur son principe*, in *QB*, 1741.

²²² Kintzler, “Préface,” in Rousseau, *Essai sur l’origine des langues*, 38.

that each listener follows a personal path in his interaction with and appreciation of an opera, its existence is also fostered through the public aspect of eloquence. It is the latter which provides the means of appreciating music's varying characteristics and measuring their effectiveness: does a given musical style or piece of music achieve *docere*, *delectare* and *movere*, does it fulfill the five categories of eloquence and properly use the faculties of the soul, are the technical proofs properly employed? In analyzing music based on these features, the theorists are able to draw interesting comparisons and criticisms of the two musical styles, as well as of the pamphlets that ensue in each *coin*. Because the debate itself is thought of in these terms, considering music in its rhetorical framework has the double effect of providing familiar (and proven) concepts to make it relatable, while allowing the reflections on music to tie into considerations concerning the quarrel's very form.

While the structured form of the debate's contributions is maintained thanks to its central duality and the use of rhetorical principles on both sides, the explosion of topics it engenders is indicative of the advent of a different way of conversing—one that requires a modification of the way in which eloquence is used. The rules of eloquence are applied differently to the *querelle des bouffons* than they had been in previous great rhetorical debates like the *querelle des Anciens et des Modernes*. The dualities of French and Italian, of Ancients and Moderns, are still crucial but the way in which they are used shifts as the debate's internal armature becomes increasingly complex through the multiplication of its thematic subsets. Although it is a simple observation, one has only to look at the participants' choice in designating the discussion: the *querelle* breaks with past debates that have contained their fundamental dichotomy (Ancients versus Moderns, color versus line, French music versus Italian music, and *Lullistes* versus *Ramistes*, to name a

few) in their chosen appellation. Within this context, the decision to simply refer to the present discussion as the *querelle* (or *guerre*) *des bouffons* is revelatory. The dyads contained within the debate are extremely important and form the vigorous intensity that is central to the quarrel, yet there is no longer a single thematic division that serves as the only—or even the essential—delimiter of exchanges: the opposition of French and Italian music may be the most prominent opposition around which the two coins are constructed, but it contains a vast multiplicity of internal topics that almost supersede their overarching guide. As we saw in the first chapter, this is a fierce quarrel of oppositions that takes its *coins* very seriously. Nevertheless, each camp holds dear a considerable number of important and evolving issues, including a reconsideration of the very principles of eloquence that the contributors realize frame the debate. Instead of abiding by a strict division along the lines of the Ancients and Moderns, and perhaps even taking advantage of the cloak offered by the conflict's bellicose outer shell, the *querelle's* leaders offer individual theories that take their side's main points and elaborate upon them. These issues are then integrated into the conversation—or not—through a form of collaborative decision-making operated via citation and referencing. From this collaborative construction, emerges the constitution of each *coin's* core principles—including a vision of clarity that values ancient principles (such as a guiding melody and strong impact through *pathos*) but also integrates a modern conception of authorial intent on the one hand, and a modern approach that seeks to restore French classicism yet integrates ancient precepts as never before on the other—, as well as a set of essential, shared concepts (including a reevaluation of the rhetorical aims of *delectare*, *docere* and *movere*, the use of *decorum* to determine good music and good argumentation, and a foundation of the two in *ethos*) that are defined differently but equally valued by each side. From

these considerations of eloquence stems an evident fear in both *coins* of “pure” music. Perhaps this is because with its rise, music heads in drastically new directions, and the loss of French music’s link to eloquence reveals a shift in the latter’s role that requires an untested adaptation.

If the obvious (but heartily-debated) answer to French music’s waning can easily be found in the embrace of the Italian genre, finding a solution to the decline of large-scale quarrels like this one—and consequently of one of eloquence’s most important roles in framing these debates—proves to be difficult. Jean-Paul Sermain observes a trend in the first part of the century towards the compartmentalization of the aims of eloquence in the elaboration of aesthetic criticism, concluding that the art of persuasion is abandoned in favor of a sort of accumulation of rhetorical knowledge that he sees as constituting the nation’s legacy through *bon goût*.²²³ Whether or not this is the case, this chapter has attempted to show that the *querelle des bouffons* reveals an attempt to define a new format of communication based on eloquence. The elaboration of a written, collective and public conversation can be seen as yielding a merging of the principles of eloquence and those of conversation adapted to a new context that values the role of varied levels of exchange as much as it does rhetorical precepts. Its textual and theoretical limits are determined through a complex system of referencing, which decides which contributions are included or ignored, enabling the written debate (whether through respect of authorial intent, close reading, or both) to develop its own theoretical framework. Based on *judicium* and the idea that eloquence requires always keeping in mind the greater good, this eloquent conversation is able to form an integration of *volonté particulière* into the public sphere of *volonté générale*. This happens not only in the public’s position as judge but also in the

²²³ Sermain, “Le Code du bon goût (1725-1750),” 939.

selection of texts by the participants: as they establish whether or not submissions merit being part of the conversation (through their inclusions, allusions and exclusions), they perform a singular act of literary activism, determining their own historicity. Based on their reformulation of the principles of eloquence and their concurrent high standards, which perceive contributions as forms of *exempla*, the quarrelers themselves decide for their contemporaries and for posterity what constitutes the *querelle*'s literary canon.

– Conclusion –

The Last Great Rhetorical Quarrel: from Duality to Multiplicity and the Elaboration of a New Musical Eloquence

“D’où je conclus que les Français n’ont point de musique et n’en peuvent avoir; ou que si jamais ils en ont une, ce sera tant pis pour eux.”¹

Rousseau’s famous conclusion to his *Lettre sur la musique française* is, as we have seen, the moment that reenergizes the debate and turns it into the full-fledged battle dubbed *la guerre des coins*.² However, our explorations have concurred with the other recent investigations into the quarrel that it is also designed to be wide sweeping and long lasting. The recent renewal of interest in the *querelle des bouffons* is symptomatic of a larger exploration among scholars of early modern intellectual quarrels as a whole. Undertakings such as the publication of Fabiano’s *La “Querelle des Bouffons” dans la vie culturelle française du XVIIIe siècle* in 2005 (which grew out of the 2002 conference bearing the same name at the Université de Clairmont-Ferrand) have begun to elucidate the complexities of its implications. They find their place among larger

¹ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 184.

² This view is reflected in Rousseau’s famous summary of the quarrel in his *Confessions*: “Tout Paris se divisa en deux partis plus échauffés que s’il se fût agi d’une affaire d’état ou de religion” (Part 2, Book 8, in *Œuvres*, 200). The description reveals the debate’s virulent nature, as well as its sociopolitical implications. We have come to see that the central position of the duality depicted by Rousseau may be somewhat diminished through a close reading of the quarrel’s texts. Nevertheless, Rousseau magnifies this aspect in looking back, at least partly because such a depiction increases the debate’s impact.

projects like the Oxford-Sorbonne “Agon” (from the Greek for “contest”) research group organized around the notion of “dispute” in the early modern period (and whose most recent colloquium, held in June 2012, was moreover devoted to “Rousseau et les querelles de son temps”). The extent to which the *querelle des bouffons* captivates the interest of a large cross-section of people can be seen in its increasing presence in popular culture, as in the creation in 2007 of a “comédie théâtrale et musicale” based on the *querelle*’s story and featuring textual and musical excerpts from its corpus,³ a cover feature of a recent issue of *The Economist* devoted to “Why We Love Music,”⁴ as well as the number of programs on France Culture that prominently feature the quarrel (such as François Noudelmann’s discussion in March 2011 with philosopher André Charrak and musicologist Pierre Saby, which focused on Rousseau’s musical interests and writings). For a long time, the topic was seen by scholars as a mere pretext to engage in a war of ideals. Even respected researchers such as Sylvie Boissou (who contributes to Fabiano’s volume on the *querelle* and whose articles have appeared in such works as Marcelle Benoit’s *Dictionnaire de la musique en France aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles*) adopt this view,⁵ which leads her to stress the ridicule of the comparison of French and Italian music (nevertheless noting the positive outcome in the form of a mixing of European musical traditions and the birth of *opéra comique*).⁶ In reality, as we have come to see, the musical commentary during the quarrel is quite serious and, in rhetorical context, the duality of French and Italian is crucial: rather than being

³ The project was conceived by Christian-David Meslé, Pauline Warnier and the ensemble Les Monts du Reuil.

⁴ The article, “Why Music?” featured in the December 20 2008-January 2 2009 issue of *The Economist* explores the vast literature (oddly referenced only by author, titles omitted) devoted to exploring “Why We Love Music,” including some of the books alluded to further on in this conclusion.

⁵ See Fabiano, *La “Querelle des Bouffons” dans la vie culturelle française du XVIIIe siècle*, 7.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 41.

replete with “haine, intolerance, provocation, vengeance and orgueil,”⁷ the *querelle*’s use of the opposition establishes a complex dialogue with real responses that build upon what was written previously and—beneath the outer layer of violent, ostensibly-unsolvable opposition—achieves true conversation. Rather than being surprised by the public’s reaction as Michael O’Dea contends, in writing his letter, the quarrel’s rhetorical frame reveals that Rousseau is in fact purposefully overstating his arguments in order to provoke a strong reaction that can then be turned into a public conversation. So, eloquence is the key that allows this type of evolution to take place: the many seemingly-violent claims put forward during the quarrel are not reflective of radicalism but a feature of eloquent discourse intended to yield a reasoned debate in which the participants remain always engaged.

This dissertation has sought to continue opening up the field, offering more in the way of future paths of exploration than concrete answers to the questions that arose from its explorations. It has delved into the texts from literary and historical perspectives, examining not only the intersections of eloquence and music but also the way in which the *querelle*’s rhetorical framing constitutes a defense of the art of eloquence and encourages the latter to take a new form. We saw that the debate begins by continuing the simple opposition of French and Italian music, and that Rousseau reconsiders the writings of the first phase, finding particular inspiration in Grimm’s *Lettre sur Omphale*, in order to turn certain contrasts into a veritable quarrel with two distinct camps. Within this context of rhetorical debating, the participants use shared, preconceived notions of eloquence and of music to guide the reader. In doing this, each *coin*

⁷ O’Dea, in *Ibid.*, 133. It should be noted that Michael O’Dea analyses well this aspect of the conflict, within the French versus foreign duality that we examined, demonstrating how Rousseau is viewed as both foreign and provincial.

places greater emphasis on the components that benefit its argumentation, creating an opposition of approaches (attack versus defense, violent impact versus measured *decorum*, foreign versus familiar, simplicity and clarity versus greater complexity and reliance on traditions) that contributes to the formation of a collective *memoria*—transferred from creator to receiver—and a fulfillment of *docere*, *delectare* and *movere* based on each side’s ideals. The *coin de la reine* uses its fondness for violent eloquence to inform its view of ideal music and contends that the latter has lessons to teach the former—extending Quintilian’s requirement concerning musical knowledge—⁸ in its unique ability to achieve a deep form of *movere* through its use of *pathos*. For the partisans of Italian music, this is music’s essential role and its strength is therefore completely appropriate. However, the *coin du roi* views the approach as excessive in every way, a mark of foreignness that is incompatible with the French measured temperament and thus with music’s primary aim of *delectare*. Although our study has refrained from reading pre-romanticism into Rousseau’s writings, the form of excess for which he and his cohorts are so beleaguered does bring to mind what is sometimes referred to as “romantic excess,” especially as it concerns a musical composition’s disregard for anything but the supreme goal of *movere*. In this sense, the *coin de la reine*’s endeavors go beyond the sublime, much as is the case with Rameau’s musical theory, in its self-sufficient, all-encompassing nature. Both of these forms of excessiveness are reminiscent of Immanuel Kant’s notion of the monstrous as essentially excessive.⁹ In an effort to avoid such immoderation and restore *delectare* to its rightful first

⁸ Quintilian requires that orators have “knowledge of the principles of music, which have power to excite or assuage the emotions of mankind” (*Institutio Oratoria*, Book 1, Chapter 10, 175), inspiring the *coin de la reine* to subtly extend this force from controlling the degree of emotion to actually moving in and of itself.

⁹ Kant presents the monstrous as something that “destroys the purpose which constitutes the concept of it” in his 1790 work devoted to aesthetic theory, the *Critique of Judgment*, 113. The concept clearly has its roots in the type of excess envisioned by the quarrelers.

position, the *coin du roi*'s view (born out of French classicism, and Rameau notwithstanding) yields a specifically-French view of *decorum* in which music and eloquence find beauty and purpose in deliberate slowness, the respect of rules and technique, as well as the values of their recent history.¹⁰ This complex discussion centered on the relationship of music and eloquence that ends up redefining the latter is in fact closer to the heart of the debate than the duality of French versus Italian. Rather, one could see it as amounting to two varying attempts to define Frenchness: the *coin du roi*'s conception of Frenchness as different in a positive way, as opposed to the *coin de la reine*'s, which seeks greater shifts, both valuing—and expressed through—the rhetorical framework that thrives on such oppositions. It is in fact perhaps when France starts its Europeanization that rhetoric begins to lose its guiding role.

This common support of the principles of eloquence (albeit using disparate approaches) and their embodiment in music—whether in considering music as eloquence or vice versa—allows the contributors to integrate deep layers of meaning and, from the start, the potential for discussing wide-ranging issues (be they socio-political, cultural or other) is well understood. Within this perception of the role of rhetoric, each side develops a relation to music through different valuations of eloquence. On the one hand, the partisans of Italian music—aligning themselves with Rousseau's general aims for the quarrel—strive to have the widest possible impact and a sort of universal reach, which actually comes from the interior: the public good is

¹⁰ On the question of technique as a solution to providing rich content and generating a subtext, Joyce Carol Oates' autobiographical sketch in *The Oxford Book of Short Stories* (which she herself edited), 607, comes to mind, in its eloquent use of music to explain the writing process and its reliance on a similar argument: "For the author, the formal challenge of "heat" [the title of the short story being introduced] was to present a narrative in a seemingly acausal manner, analogous to the playing of a piano sans pedal; as if each paragraph, or chord, were separate from the rest. For how otherwise can we speak of the unspeakable, except through the prism of technique?" For Oates, as for the *coin du roi*, technique provides access and clarity. It does not negate unity, since there is still a musical whole, but the blurring or confusion—as in too much reliance on the pedal in piano playing—is removed and a certain independence of each part exists within the whole.

founded on introspection or finding what is needed within and bringing it out, achieving a sort of fusion of interior and exterior through eloquence. The musical model is clear: music's direct impact is primarily achieved on an internal level that is then brought outward through the music in order to resonate with the listener. On the other hand, the French corner tailors its content to what it views as its public's specificity. In both cases, the idea of receptive *memoria* is in play: whether through its incomparable strength or its measured appeal, music persuades in such a fashion that participants choose a side and all that it represents. We saw that the construction of this collective *memoria* is based on ancient principles, but it also increases the role of *delectatio* (often seen by the *coin du roi* as music's primary, if not only role) and values the French approach to secondary works. This is true both in the process of writing and reading: intellectual pleasure is key not only for the contributors in their use and readings of previous works but also for the reader who is one step removed (one might say the secondary reader of these secondary works). It is thus collective *memoria* that gives credence to the notion of the reader as judge. While the idea may initially have seemed like a pretense, it is ultimately taken quite seriously by all involved and requires a high level of involvement on the part of the reading public. In order to ensure the reader fulfills his role and to hold his attention, the thinkers create memorable moments that are mapped on musical *leitmotifs*.

Indeed, music's special force is further seen in its comparison to painting (in some respects a more obvious choice for debate), and the way in which eloquence and music affect each other (rather than merely the former impacting the latter) not only through music's power but also in its ability to elicit close listening. The latter is a key concept for both sides, which Rousseau translates into a call for strong authorial intent and the respect thereof. Participants are

held accountable for familiarizing themselves with the debate's exchanges and, in their responses, are expected to engage in the philological work of ferretting out not only a given pamphlet's hidden subtext but also the author's point of view. The power of the Word is immense for Rousseau, which partly explains his reluctance to consider instrumental music: it is clear that there can be no eloquence if the fundamental linguistic link is lost. This principle is encapsulated in the notion of "unité de mélodie," with melody forming the musical translation of a single linguistic idea—one guiding thought that provides the clarity and simplicity needed to achieve persuasion (with greater complexity existing in the internal layers that are revealed to close readers)—, in opposition to the obvious, outward complications of a method that relies on harmony.¹¹ The latter is also indicative of the French side's voluntary reliance on technique—in composition as in performance—conceived as a positive, central element. In both approaches, ancient precepts are incorporated and elements of modernity (whether in the *coin du roi's* scientific approach and reliance on French classicism or the *coin de la reine's* modern vision of intellectualized *inventio*), resulting in the beginning of an internal attenuation of the dualities that appear so strong on the outside.

Thus, in order to demonstrate the relevance of eloquence in framing vast debates like the *querelle*, the thinkers engage in a process that identifies its most essential constituent parts, sometimes going as far as to remove or at least attenuate what they view as ornamental. In so doing, eloquence itself becomes musical (since music is seen as having already achieved such an

¹¹ The impact of the melody-harmony debate continues to be felt to this day. For example, Oliver Sacks writes that "Tchaikovsky was keenly aware that his great fertility in melody was not matched by a comparable grasp of musical structure" and describes Beethoven as "a great architectonic composer" (*Musicophilia: Tales of Music and the Brain*, 92), indicating that melody and harmony are still viewed much as they were during the quarrel, in terms of their general roles and rapport of stark opposition.

adaptation) in this reduction to its essence. In fact, the relationship of eloquence and music is founded in part on determining what is central and what is ornamental: both have a role to play but are approached in almost exactly opposed fashions by the two *coins*—what is ornamental for one side is often what the other camp considers central. Nevertheless, the two parties agree that discourse and music are tied through not only their valuation of the essential but also their incorporation of ornament. The latter may be seen as superfluous but it is necessary in that it both detains sentimental force (as in turns of phrase that appeal to certain readers or musical performance practices that evoke a country's traditions) and allows for the construction of what is in fact central. In exploring the link between these two fundamental facets of eloquence and music, the quarrelers are precisely often able to define their core principles by contrasting them with elements they deem secondary. What results is the formation of a written eloquence that incorporates the private (in the form of philosophical considerations, the development of a hidden subtext and the integration of each participant's personal views) into a public conversation (serving the common good and thus being held to high standards) that both relies on eloquence as a framework (with particular emphases on *decorum* and *ethos* in both camps) and inscribes the quarrel in the reciprocal act of conversing (through an elaborate web of cross-referencing and the inclusion of the public as an active participant, whether through engaged reading or in its alignment with either side). The dualities that seemed to virtually overshadow all other aspects of the conversation at the onset continue to hold an important position, but it becomes clear that they no longer form the debate's center. Rather, certain essential precepts of both eloquence and music are used to open the way for multifaceted discussions and, although each pamphleteer is unflinching in his allegiance to his chosen side, the quarrel's mode of

conversation encourages not only multiplicity but also the integration of diverse arguments that fit logically and ethically into each *coin*'s overarching visions—even if these components are normally associated with the opposing side. The final effect of this framework is a sort of self-generating, collaborative literary corpus: by virtue of the referencing, citing and interplay between the texts, works of value are determined by their inclusion in—or exclusion from—the conversation. So, even though the public is the ultimate judge, the notion of authorial intent extends to a form of communal selection based on an agreement among the participants as to whether works merit the close reading—and consequent discussion—that is so vital to the debate.

In their strong defense of an ideal form of eloquence, the quarrel's thinkers value music because it has reached its apogee (whether in *opera seria* or in a new *tragédie lyrique*). They envision an archetype—a musical eloquence—that can be attained in a similar fashion. Removing inessential elements and perfecting what each side sees as the core rhetorical principles allows the formation of a new type of public, written eloquence based on ancient ideals and continuing the tradition of conversation. The risk for this newfound model lies in its inclusiveness, which would probably entail ceasing to rely on the bellicose approach still valued in the *querelle*: by adapting almost too well to social demands, both in terms of format and content, eloquence's newfound flexibility may lead to the demise of its guiding role. Although the fundamental principles chosen on either side are the judgment criteria for the *querelle*, the public's new role and a perhaps too-great willingness to adapt—which comes belatedly, with the rhetorical framework already having begun to be seen as old fashioned—leads to rhetoric no longer being deemed necessary in conceptualizing and structuring public discussions (the

definition of the latter also being under reconsideration). Its fundamental principles are still valued and used, but are no longer seen as filling the same social and intellectual need as they had in the past. In a sense, the very efforts to perfect eloquence in the way music has been result in its destruction as the architect of great debates.

Nevertheless, thinkers from the *querelle*'s two factions seek to uphold eloquence as both the means and the arbiter of their debate and, more generally, as the most useful framework for engaging in this type of discussion. In his *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, Rousseau reflects on different levels of pleasure, opposing the basic (or mechanical and unthinking) to the emotive (or that which is related to signification, indicating that the pleasure we take in seeing a painting is not merely derived from its colors),¹² not only underlining the link of artistic production to a linguistic motivation (the painter and the composer first verbalizing their intent) but also the importance of the intellectual. Similarly, the reward for close listening and close reading, as well as for deciphering the quarrel's subtext, provides this higher level of pleasure. In this sense, eloquence—in its advocating of strong authorial intent and close reading—is similar to philosophy: both are opposed to science in that they are essentially intellectual, unlike science, which is closer to the first, basic form of pleasure. It is therefore possible to see eloquence as philosophical in that its very aim—persuasion—would not exist if there were proof certain of what is being debated or pondered. This uncertainty is what joins the two and also, for Rousseau, what engenders true thought, and true pleasure. Eloquence is particularly valuable in its embodiment of this questioning, along with a fundamental linguistic link to and a reliance on the emotive (in its ancient form). As for music, while painting is relatively literal and easy to define

¹² Rousseau, *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, 105. This theme recurs throughout the rest of the *Essai*.

(the depiction of a scene, for instance, may have a varying impact but certain aspects are bound to be inarguable), musical production is open to a multitude of interpretations and is the most emotive art form. So, by becoming musical, eloquence also becomes philosophical.

The obvious problem with such a perception of music and of musical eloquence is that this could lead to complete indecision in the form of constant questioning. This is yet another reason to engage in a debate that respects certain rules, the first and most obvious being that any effective quarrel is divided into two main sides. Patterned on the rhetorical framework of debates past, we saw that this structure prevents indecision and furthers firm engagement. The sources of the *coin de la reine* can be found before the quarrel proper begins, in Grimm's unknowing formation of its main constituent parts in his *Lettre sur Omphale*. From there, Rousseau guides the debate by impelling his opponents to take defensive positions, and by using a number of dualities—Ancients versus Moderns, Asianism versus Atticism, line versus color, a transcultural version of sublimity versus the traditional conception of the sublime... The quarrel's rhetorical context thus relies on debates past, but is also indicative of an opening towards vast areas of exploration and the eventual breaking down of a system that rests solely on a central division. Rather, the *querelle*'s inner workings destroy the idea of depending on a central duality in the manner of the Ancients and Moderns, using this model for its outer shell but also incorporating greater multiplicity: inwardly, a search for the core principles of eloquence and music yields a reconsideration of eloquence itself. These essential components are preserved and even furthered, forming the points that guide the debate. So, instead of remaining governed purely by the notion of Italian versus French opera, the quarrelers use the musical and rhetorical elements they deem most important as the axes around which they organize their attacks, with enough

flexibility for either side to borrow concepts traditionally associated with their opponents (such as the *coin du roi*'s incorporation of a number of ancient precepts or the *coin de la reine*'s valuing of a certain intellectualism). Often there is even an agreement as to what is central, such as in the repeated calls for *decorum* on both sides, and determining what defines this is what is really under consideration. In the case of *decorum*, the French side restricts the concept to a very precise idea of measure and restraint being the most appropriate for French incarnations of music and eloquence based on its suitability for the French people. The heritage of French classicism and the country's position of intellectual leadership dictate this approach. For the Italian corner, the reliance on *pathos* and desire to realize *movere*—above all and by any means—in order to achieve persuasion is in fact also an interpretation of *decorum*: in eloquence as in music, one must adapt to the audience and the situation, both of which currently demand strong impact. This vision also ties into Rousseau's idea of strong authorial intent and the goal of educating the reader or listener, which dictate that *res* can only be suitably matched by strong impact in *verba*.

Within such definitions, each thinker brings his own perspective as to the finer points. For example, Castel sees *decorum* as also defined by a difference between French and Italian music that amounts to an opposition of everyday music and music for special occasions. The former is essential because it forms the lifeblood of the people, whereas the position of artistic production and eloquence as vital parts of the culture will be lost if they become overly special, which is to say out of the ordinary. Both eloquence and music must be defended as part of society's lifeblood, an idea with which the *coin de la reine* agrees. However, for the Italian side, what is seen as excessive by the French is the very essence needed to achieve the three aims of eloquence and ensure that both rhetoric and music continue to thrive. In the *coin du roi*'s rebuttal

of this approach, one can see an idea that recurs today, with the sense of a spiraling out of control that leads to the public becoming desensitized and the resulting efforts of authors and composers (replicated by our cinematographers and news producers) feeding an addiction that always requires more to shock and arouse: “Toujours retirés en eux-mêmes, les Italiens n’en peuvent sortir que par des éclats: il leur faut comme des coups de force pour les réveiller,”¹³ writes Castel. This, for the partisans of French music, is the sort of sensationalism that leads to Italian music’s inappropriate excessiveness. Too much introspection (“retirés en eux-mêmes”) results in an inability to appreciate communal pleasures. So, Castel is forming a critique of individualism, born from excess and that can only be rescued by a return to moderation and a restoration of shared French values. The importance of recapturing the essence of music is seen on the other side as well, where it also implies an appreciation of past work—though not that of recent years. Thus, Grimm affirms that “il faut que... le Musicien en saisisse le véritable esprit, et lui donne la vraie déclamation, car il n’y en a qu’une: l’homme de génie la trouve quelquefois, mais elle reste éternellement cachée au Musicien vulgaire.”¹⁴ The importance of intellectual production even in music reveals how the *coin de la reine* sometimes takes an approach that would normally be associated with the other side. However, it results from both the Enlightenment and a sense that artifice and technique are being overvalued in the opposite camp. For the partisans of Italian music, the best way to get away from this easy use of technique (which results in the “vulgaire”) is a return to antiquity. This “véritable esprit” or essence is sought in the quarrel’s texts and seen as embodied by great music. Indeed, it amounts to the way in which, as good listeners, we can instantly recognizing a composer (there is no confusing Bach with Campra or Pergolesi). This

¹³ Castel, *Lettres d’un Académicien de Bordeaux sur le fonds de la Musique*, in *QB*, 1431.

¹⁴ Grimm, *Lettre sur Omphale*, in *QB*, 22.

quality is envied by Rousseau who clearly would like authorial production to benefit from the same clear essence. Thus, his endorsement of strong authorial intent is a way of asking written eloquence to achieve this by learning from music: the required close reading and analyses of literary texts are the best hopes for an in-depth understanding on the reader's part, and they also allow the public to cultivate its knowledge in a way that will benefit not only itself but also authors, ensuring the posterity of literary works.

Valuing the principles of eloquence leads to certain ethical and moral values holding true, one of which can be seen in the consequent positioning throughout the quarrel's texts of the public as judge. The *Examen de deux principes avancés par Monsieur Rameau*'s conclusion places the emphasis anew on the proper roles of technicians as opposed to thinkers, as Rousseau did throughout the *querelle*. In so doing, when Rousseau declares in his essay's final paragraph that "le public nous jugera,"¹⁵ he posits the careful reader on the side of the thinkers, while also alluding to the quarrel's very public nature and the debate's importance for posterity (since the final judgment has yet to be pronounced). This *da capo* to the quarrel ("Je jetai cet écrit sur le papier en 1755,"¹⁶ writes Rousseau in the "Avertissement" to this retrospective text) allows its author to present himself as the party arguing "pour l'utilité de l'art et pour l'honneur de la vérité"¹⁷ against Rameau's mere "outrages"¹⁸—a summing up of Rousseau's view of the quarrel itself and a clear attempt to influence not only his contemporaries but, as so often done by the thinker, generations to follow.

¹⁵ Rousseau, *Examen de deux principes avancés par Monsieur Rameau*, 212.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 191

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 212

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 213.

Repositioning the quarrel thusly not only confirms its far-reaching ambitions but also ensures Rousseau and his partisans are likely to be seen as the victors. From a purely musical standpoint, one might at the very best declare no immediate winner, or one could go so far as to see Rameau and the *coin du roi* as having an advantage, since the Italian repertoire defended during the quarrel comes and goes with the *bouffons*. If music remains unaffected in France immediately following the *querelle*, acknowledging the quarrel's hidden intellectual program is a necessary step to helping everyone understand the winning side is in fact Rousseau's. Always pragmatic and abiding by the rhetorical principles that governed the *querelle*, Rousseau realizes that the ongoing process of disproving Rameau's theories of harmony—while important on personal and purely musical levels—is secondary to the task of winning on as many fronts as possible in the debate's public facet. He was certainly right to believe the quarrel would go on to be viewed as one of the decisive moments of the Enlightenment. Perhaps this why, even with the quarrel finished, Rousseau continues to encourage an examination of its discussions. Thus, he designs his *Essai sur l'origine des langues* for the post-quarrel landscape, as a way of prolonging the conversation in its evolved form and guiding retrospective conclusions in the way he had the debate proper. This attempt to influence the long-term effect of the quarrel or at least the manner in which subsequent commentators will reflect on the event and its position in history is successful. For our purposes, the work is also particularly noteworthy in its reflective quality and its conscious desire to explain the *querelle des bouffons*.

Along these lines, the quarrel can be viewed as intellectual and historical contemplation, ensuring an enduring place for its authors and its ideas. Although it is among the shortest, totaling one page, the eighth chapter of the *Essai* is devoted to the geographical aspect of the

origin of languages and its inclusion is significant. The passage constitutes a revival of one of the central themes (climate theory) developed throughout the quarrel, while prompting Rousseau to make a claim that gives his reader particular insight into his methodology and thus the way in which he sought to frame the *querelle*: “Le grand défaut des Européens est de philosopher toujours sur les origines des choses d’après ce qui se passe autour d’eux.”¹⁹ For one, the statement explains the chapter’s title (“Différence générale et locale dans l’origine des langues,” with the declaration forming a critique of a myopic approach that would, in the case of French music, look at the form’s own evolution without taking into account its southern origins and their progression)²⁰ and its very reason for being. It is also a clear call for historically-aware readings and a reinforcement of the philological idea espoused during the quarrel: just as considering something ahistorically leads to incorrect knowledge and assumptions, examining texts out of their creators’ intended context is detrimental.²¹ In essence, properly situating the source is key for all types of text and, to be sure, almost any intellectual production—literary, philosophical, theoretical, musicological and indeed musical.

This brings about a new approach to written, public conversation, which requires strong and intelligent leadership. It is therefore interesting to see Rousseau describe (in the *Essai*’s twelfth chapter on the origins of music) the curiously-French *académies*²² carrying out an experiment in recreating Greek musical performance. While Rousseau states he admires the effort, it is clear that academicians do not have the wherewithal or openness of mind needed to

¹⁹ Rousseau, *Essai sur l’origine des langues*, 81.

²⁰ According to Rousseau’s climate theory (*Ibid.*), the difference between French and Italian music is the result of a gradual form of *refroidissement* that occurs as language and music leave their origins to head north.

²¹ See Chapter 3 for a full look at this penchant for philological work.

²² Rousseau, *Essai sur l’origine des langues*, 103-104.

successfully accomplish anything resembling the *fora* of ancient Greece. In fact, Rousseau concludes by describing modern-day French orators as having all the grace and eloquence of savage Amerindians. Although savage people are regularly portrayed as positive in a sort of virgin state and natural intuitiveness when it comes to their untainted musical knowledge and appreciation of the best types of music, being compared to them in one's capacity for highly-evolved eloquence—whether in debate or music—is not positive. Rousseau thus returns fully-evolved thinkers to a barbaric state that is not the one of the model savage and that has none of the qualities of ancient ideals and from which there is no escape (because, going back to Rousseau's climate theory, the French have ignored the rest of the world and have therefore lost all hope of adaptability to what has occurred around them), confirming the position of the *coin du roi* during the quarrel as devoid of hope. Perhaps Rousseau is countering his adversaries' chief claim that the *coin de la reine* was always excessive, by returning the accusation and creating a link between French institutions and French thinkers: the way in which they use *logos* is so narrow and self-absorbed that it sees itself as a universal solution, leading to a form of excessiveness—or monstrosity, as we saw earlier—that is uniquely French. Thus, in the following chapter Rousseau depicts an imaginary French painter who explains the scientific foundations of his art as containing the key to all arts—even “de toutes les sciences”²³—and suspiciously resembles Rousseau's depiction of Rameau in his quarrel texts. In addition to constituting a reaffirmation of the absurdity of any art as explaining science, this is also a wink to the reader who is expected to have read the quarrel's many pamphlets. Although couched as a discourse on painting, the reference to Rameau could not be any clearer, especially given its

²³ *Ibid.*, 107.

careful positioning at the end of a chapter on melody and thus almost introducing the one that follows, which just happens to focus on harmony.²⁴ In the event these subtleties might not be evident to all, the link to Rameau is explicitly confirmed in the paragraph that follows, with the mention of a hypothetical “musicien qui, plein de préjugés semblables, croirait voir dans la seule harmonie la source des grands effets de la musique”²⁵ and whose wonderfully ironic punishment is to be condemned to write French operas. The overt confirmation of what the reader immediately suspected in reading the description of the insanely ambitious painter is proof positive that Rousseau is referring to the quarrel and reaffirms the need to read the latter’s texts attentively.

This post-*querelle* close reading is an homage to the same phenomenon during the quarrel proper, which is one of the elements that allowed the use of eloquence to be effective: the proof of eloquence’s successful persuasion lies in moving to act, and this happens in good part thanks to philological readings (the examples of which are provided by the pamphleteers, as we saw, but which are then expected of the quarrel’s reader). In a general fashion, the participants, readers and public at large are all moved to take one side or the other, but there are also some examples of more specific results. For instance, the *coin du roi* is moved to take Rameau as its leader: when he is promoted to the position by Rousseau, his opponents could well refuse the proposition, yet they feel compelled to accept. Even more concretely, the political leadership is moved to dismiss the *bouffons* in 1754, putting an end the *querelle*. Whatever their reason, one motivating factor may have been a fear of the *coin de la reine* emerging victorious and all that

²⁴ Chapters 13 and 14 of the *Essai sur l’origine des langues* respectively bear the simple titles “De la mélodie” and “De l’harmonie.”

²⁵ *Essai sur l’origine des langues*, 107.

this would have implied for French music, the crown and society as a whole. With the *bouffons*' departure, the French and Italian opposition is negated (especially with the arrival of Gluck, whom many see—whether or not accurately—as the incarnation of a French form of opera as it was espoused by the partisans of Italian music during the quarrel) and, as we noted earlier, this will in fact precipitate the demise of rhetoric's framing role.

Another way in which eloquence is preserved is through an evolution in conversation. Just as Rousseau presents a progression from the familial (the only form of community in barbaric times) to the social (as an evolved form), eloquence has moved from dialogue form into a more complex and interwoven version of public conversation founded on sociopolitical and literary bases, and motivated by a social—and moral—objective. In this sense, the defense of eloquence is a defense of the humanities, reflecting the human need for something larger than one's own ambitions, perhaps moral and definitely engaged (in the act of writing and in the defense of social and political ideas).²⁶ As explored in Chapter 4, the *querelle des bouffons* leads to a written form of public conversation that merges private and public; it is a defense of

²⁶ In addition to a reconsideration of the way in which eloquence can be successfully preserved and used, the quarrel uses music to discuss larger issues, including politics. We saw indications of this in the literary subtext but there are also some explicit passages that show the importance of music as facilitating such conversations. For instance, Castel mentions government types specifically as influencing music, positioning the latter as reflection of former. He then goes on to note: "Nos Musiciens qui vont un peu terre à terre, un peu sagement, régulièrement, timidement selon le caractère national de notre existence même, sagement monarchique et bien réglée, se révoltent d'abord contre tous ces accords libertins et capricieux en effet" (*Lettres d'un académicien de Bordeaux*, in *QB*, 1423). It is particularly interesting that Castel should present the reaction against Italian music as revolutionary, turning the *coin du roi*'s defense into an active, vibrant effort. The notion of Italian music being libertine contrasts liberty and the monarchy, a point the author reinforces: "... plus libre, elle [la musique italienne] ne s'assujettit point aux règles qu'elle a faites, aimant mieux en éclore de nouvelles" (*Ibid.*, 1426). The Italian side establishes the rules only to break them but there is a certain appeal in this very French characteristic. Indeed, even though Castel portrays his epistolary writer as immensely proud of French music, the allure of Italian liberty is clear: "Les Italiens ont une Musique un peu sauvage, saillante, essorée, libre, et presque libertine, capricieuse (*caprizant*) licencieuse, supérieure aux règles et à nous par conséquent qui sommes peut-être la règle, le régulateur, le balancier, le pendule de l'horloge dont ils sont le ressort, le poids et nous le contrepoids" (*Ibid.*, 1422). For Castel, being the counterweight is positive—a point of pride that restores order and moderation in light of Italian excess (again emphasizing "libertine," which is to say above the rules). However, his portrayal sums up the way in which Italian music is viewed as liberating and, for many, this is something to which one can aspire.

eloquence in its essential form but adapted to a modern view of conversation and inspired by music's unique abilities. Indeed, the quarrel's thinkers begin to see in music the ability to touch individuals while expressing the universal sentiments that Richard Wagner would ascribe to it in the following century: "[Music] does not express the passion, love, or longing of such-and-such an individual on such-and-such an occasion, but passion, love and longing itself."²⁷ For the *coin de la reine*, the phenomenon is built on Rousseau's theories of language, as eloquence too only finds its significance within a larger social order: one does not really need to convince to any great extent within a family or small social unit, and rhetoric's principles find their fulfillment in the need for greater interaction, mutual intellectual challenging and the shifts that come with a communal exploration of ideas. At the same time, in order to avoid losing its essence (as in languages' loss of their "accent séducteur"),²⁸ a link to the form's roots must be maintained. On this point, the two *coins* are in agreement. Eloquence achieves this by restoring seductiveness through musicality: musical eloquence relies on *ingenium* (whether in its instinctual facet or in a version that is the product of enculturation) and places a high value on *movere* (as conceived differently by each *coin*) in order to affect the reader in the manner he would be when listening to good music.²⁹

The idea of music and language being intertwined—as the "neveu" in Diderot's 1762 *Neveu de Rameau* will put it, "Il faut considérer la déclamation comme une ligne, et le chant

²⁷ Wagner, "Ein glücklicher Abend," reprinted by Gatz in *Musik-Aesthetik* from the *Gazette Musicale*, n. 56-68, as cited by Langer in *Philosophy in a New Key: A Study in the Symbolism of Reason, Rite, and Art*, 221.

²⁸ Rousseau, *Essai sur l'origine des langues*, 97.

²⁹ Music's remarkable impact was recognized by both *coins* and continues to ignite interest today, often in forms that reflect the *querelle*'s influence. For example, Oliver Sacks remarks that "music itself... has something very peculiar—its beat, its melodic contours, so different from those of speech, and its peculiarly direct connection to the emotions" (*Musicophilia: Tales of Music and the Brain*, 40). Even if the non-linguistic aspect of music is emphasized here by Sacks, the importance of melody in achieving strong impact is reminiscent of Rousseau's quarrel theories.

comme une autre ligne qui serpenterait sur la première”—³⁰ and yielding the former’s special force, from which eloquence should learn, is a view that is widespread. Furthermore, this combination of music with its linguistic source forms what Diderot considers “sublime,”³¹ a concept he defines based on the principles of eloquence (including *varietas* and *movere*, in music’s ability to appeal to any type of audience, as well as *logos*, *ethos* and *pathos* in the logical and ethical link of song to truth and its concurrent ability to effect strong impact—it is “forte et vraie”).³² The linguistic inspiration of music so strong that it can inspire eloquence takes many different shapes. For instance, it exists in instrumental music that seeks to model itself after language. One such example is the opening to Bach’s *Johannes-Passion*, in which instruments are very clearly used like human voices. In particular, the oboes’ melodies are unmistakably language-based in their phrasing and replication of the qualities of vocal song. Additionally, given Bach’s known use of rhetoric in composition, such moments seem to be the full development of instrumental music as eloquence. A later example involving song can be found in nineteenth-century *lieder*. Inherited from sung storytelling dating back to medieval troubadour songs, the *lied* is often a condensed, short form that packs in everything at its disposal—including variety in range, dynamics and *tempi*, as well as a textual inspiration that covers a myriad of emotions—to achieve the strongest impact. For example, in Schubert’s *Der Elkönig*, the combination of words and music is clearly more powerful than one or the other on their own, and is particularly successful at moving the listener to the highest possible degree. Even today, musicians continue to see a linguistic inspiration behind instrumental music. Thus, in a recent

³⁰ Diderot, *Le Neveu de Rameau*, 105.

³¹ *Ibid.*

³² *Ibid.*

master class, celebrated pianist Murray Perahia described the process by which he consistently associates specific stories with pieces of music and then focuses on telling the stories during his performances, using this linguistic motivation to bring about the appropriate emotions in the listener and revealing that eloquence and music are still intertwined.³³

During the quarrel, one reason composers seek to harness the combined power of music and language to achieve rhetorical goals has to do with Rousseau's version of *memoria*. For dix-huitiémiste Claude Habib, Rousseau is deeply eloquent and defined by what she calls his "capacité de retenue,"³⁴ by which she means his effect on us as readers: like the king humming Colin's air from *Le Devin du village*, we are easily able to remember his big ideas. Clearly, Rousseau was successful in incorporating the notion of collective *memoria* through his strong authorial voice to create clear but impactful moments, within the context of his *œuvre*. This is something he also wanted for the *querelle* and that he manages to foster, with his contemporaries and thinkers to this day being acquainted with at least the basic outlines of the debate. It is in this sense that the *querelle des bouffons* is the last great quarrel framed by eloquence. We saw that many other quarrels exist at the time and continue afterwards (such as with the debate of Gluckistes versus Piccinistes), but subsequent discussions do not achieve this scale, nor do they seem to have the same grand ambitions or cultural impact as the *querelle des bouffons*.

³³ The master class was given at Juilliard in New York City on October 3 2012. The idea of conveying emotion rather than a given story's specificity, even though the former comes out of the latter (in an act of complex translation—from music to language and then back again—that hints at the notion of literary translation examined a few pages down), goes towards Wagner's notion of music as expressing a form of universality (cited in footnote 27). Perahia also emphasized the importance of *pathos*, much in the way it is applied to music by Rousseau and the *coin de la reine*. As for the notion of appropriateness, Perahia additionally noted the importance of not being "too pretty," which impedes the deep sound needed to convey an emotionally-fraught piece. Clearly, *decorum* is also still a valuable notion in musical reflection and performance.

³⁴ Finkielkraut, "L'Héritage de Rousseau."

There is no doubt that rhetoric continues to exist in some form to this day, sometimes even in a manifestation that resembles its use during the quarrel. Along these lines, Rousseau's particular proclivity for incorporating his adversaries' approaches and vocabulary into his own in order to create inversed argumentation resurfaces in varied contexts, such as Steve Jobs' keynote address at WWDC 2010.³⁵ In announcing the iPhone 4, Apple's then Chief Executive Officer described the company's new "retina display" as "your window into the Internet, into your apps, into your media, into your software," stressing in his conclusion that it was "like the best window on the planet."³⁶ Close listeners will have spotted the use of his adversaries' terminology to claim superiority. In the recurrent use of the word "window" to create an implicit allusion to Microsoft Windows, Jobs managed to subtly emphasize the way in which his device and software do better what his opponents set out to accomplish.

It is in its quarrel form (with its link to music leading it to value violence, *pathos* and strong impact), as opposed to its overly-technical use that was then and continues to be criticized, that eloquence remains effective today. Yet, rhetoric is no longer used as the framework for great intellectual debates. In part, this is due to a movement away from groups and the mass efforts of the *querelles*, which were based on the idea of dialogue and conversation, towards the disappearance of large-scale written discussions and a sort of individuality based on monologues. As a result of today's increased individualization (with such technological innovations as TiVo, the iPod, cell phones, etc.), groups find themselves redefined in order to revolve around the individual. Interaction exists but it is centered squarely on the individual, customized for each person, with streams of information arriving on a Twitter feed or a

³⁵ Apple Inc.'s Worldwide Developers' Conference took place on June 7 2010 in San Francisco, California.

³⁶ Jobs, "WWDC 2010 Keynote Address."

Facebook page, each user receiving content pulled from many sources but isolated onto individual sites and devices.

Kintzler posits French classical theater as dying because of the advent of opera.³⁷ One could say that the death of eloquence in its framing role is partially due to a rise of the individual, coupled with the movement towards instrumental music. Although the latter is not directly responsible for the decline of eloquence's function, its rise is feared and causes a loss of music's ties to eloquence as we saw them conceived throughout the *querelle*. This in turn points to a decline in the debate's format. The latter has become too restrictive in the years following the quarrel, whereas it was just the opposite in 1752: using eloquence to frame the debate and music as its topic allowed for a form of freedom dissimulated within structures and rules. This covert aspect allowed participants to escape censure and get away with commentary otherwise not possible under a monarchy. With social and political changes under foot, music adapts to the new world. At least in part, it does so by abandoning the rules of French classical theater and adapting their essence (such as the idea of *vraisemblance*) to its new format and the requirements of the contemporary audience. Eloquence as the guide and arbiter of debates is not able to do the same. It is unable to match the evolution in content with an adaptation of form: while the quarrel's thinkers broach all sorts of topics and consider many different perspectives (such as the foreign versus the familiar), eloquence remains codified and stays relatively narrow. The thinkers' attempt to extract what is essential—much as they realize music has managed to do—arrives too late, with a shift in how conversation is perceived already having begun.

³⁷ Kintzler, *Poétique de l'opéra français de Corneille à Rousseau*, 288.

However, the questioning of music's role, beyond providing pleasure, remains important after the quarrel and continues to this day. During the quarrel, music is used to discuss other topics, rather than the reverse. In order to do so, the participants are truly interested in music itself and the way in which its lessons can be applied to other areas, rendering its choice as a topic quite serious and much more than a simple pretext. By looking at its impact on other, familiar forms, music also becomes less abstract: attempting to understand its workings—not so much from a technical standpoint as in its acknowledged but difficult-to-define greater dimension—without relating music to more tangible concepts would not bear fruitful results. In fact, rather than trying to explain this aspect of music, transferring its applications to thematic questions outside of the musical realm—such as political matters or the formal deliberations derived from eloquence—enables music to have a greater independence than previously allowed, without diminishing the debate's fundamental conceptual systems. We saw that French music represents elements of a social and political order and that its partisans, inspired by the debate of Atticism versus Asianism, use music to defend French traditions and values, opposing these to the hasty and excessive qualities of their opponents' innovation. Thinkers such as Rousseau conversely see French music as the embodiment of a general societal stagnation or, worse, a deliberate refusal to adapt that results in a loss of core values. He proposes a solution, which is to steer French music in a direction opposite from its current trajectory, which he knows full well to be impossible:

... En un mot le vrai récitatif français, s'il peut y en avoir un, ne se trouvera que dans une route directement contraire à celle de Lully et de ses successeurs, dans quelque route nouvelle qu'assurément les compositeurs français, si fiers de leur faux savoir, et par conséquent si éloignés de sentir

et d'aimer le véritable, ne s'aviseront pas de chercher si tôt et que probablement ils ne trouveront jamais.³⁸

Once again, French pride is based on the recent increase in technique—which we saw Rousseau believes is the result of excessive civilization that results in its very decline—, impeding the *coin du roi* from seeing a return to simplicity as the only (albeit admittedly impossible) solution. This is confirmed in French music's inability to Europeanize. Within this presentation, Rousseau's positioning of Rameau as Lully's descendent (the main figure among “ses successeurs”) also reveals the quarrel's impact on music theory: to this day, music historians often present a vision of French music that has been affected by this perception. Furthermore, we saw that the quarrel's musical topic allows for wide-ranging discussions. Rousseau's function as a well-educated but nevertheless non-expert contributor encourages the involvement of thinkers who might otherwise be intimidated by the seemingly specialized nature of the debate and, once they engage, music offers opportunities to broach varied topics. This is partly why Rousseau is more interested in music than painting (unlike Diderot), the former's innate complexity providing opportunities:

... Mais sans les bras et le jeu de l'actrice, je suis persuadé que personne n'en pourrait souffrir le récitatif, et que pareille musique a grand besoin du secours des yeux pour être supportable aux oreilles.³⁹

In this instance, French music needs visual aids to have any sort of value. On the other end of the spectrum, good music—like written text—relies on its own merits. In part, it is able to do so by incorporating multiple layers of meaning. The visual is easier to understand and far more direct, but it is also consequently less rich. Though the written word has a visual aspect, as do musical

³⁸ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 175.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 183.

notes, the arts of eloquence and music are highly cerebral—though sometimes deceptively simple—and therefore more suited to opening up the range of considerations and achieving broad impact.

It is within this simultaneous view of music as detaining special force but also serving as an entry into other areas that a new form of written eloquence is developed. Indeed, the quarrel's format as preeminently written, and the key to understanding it as a modern form of public conversation, relies on published writing as an act of public expression (for Rousseau, opposed to the private realm of philosophy), while strong authorial intent is a manifestation of individual *ingenium*. Going from the essentially oral realm of oratorical eloquence to this new written form is an act of translation that, just like the merging of public and private, achieves an evolution from a mindset of pure (and deep) division—the residue of which exists in the two *coins*—to a breaking down of the latter through an internal incorporation of a complex grid of exchange, both overt (in referencing) and hidden (in the persistent subtext). Profound duality continues to exist in the outer layers of the debate and in thinking of the debate as a quarrel, but a great multiplicity grows within. As we explored, the two *coins* are more firmly proprietary than ever (with no crossing over permitted), but within these groups there is greater variability than ever (including the inclusion of ideas that would normally be seen as belonging to the other side).

The act of written translation born from this diversity is what gives the quarrel a literary dimension. The integration of rhetoric into literature is operated through writing, with the notions of a *littérature secrète* and multi-layering—which can only exist in the written form—leading to a new type of written conversation. As we explored, this phenomenon is considered within the eloquence-music construct, which relies on writing at its very genesis: Dubos has already

concluded that the proximity of Greek song to declamation meant that there must have originally been a written form. So, the *querelle*'s new definition of eloquence is in fact partly a reintegration of rhetoric into its rightful literary position.⁴⁰ There is a concurrent reintegration of the elite with the general reader: although the intellectual elite continues to play a leading role, the public occupies a vital position as the veritable arbiter of the quarrel, whereas it was conceived as relatively ignorant in the seventeenth century.⁴¹ As a result, the question of the reader's position and the quarrel's literary quality constitute a good part of its appeal for the quarrel's contemporaries as well as for today's reader. In the way an author like Haruki Murakami shuttles between the worlds of fiction and reality, and between Japanese and Western (American, in particular),⁴² the quarrel's writers alternate between an adaptation of *dialogues* that is akin to translated oratory, the use of literary devices (both in certain stylistic elements and in the way in which storytelling is used and analyzed), as well as epistolary writing and scientific demonstrations on the one hand, and between the familiar and the foreign on the other. The reason behind this has everything to do with the ultimate aim of persuasion, though restricting the debate's exploration to the merits of French and Italian music becomes increasingly implausible the more one delves into this subtext, as we have seen. The idea of translation, for lack of a better word, in an elaboration of eloquence that relies on a movement between different genres and themes is crucial: this is not merely transcription or transfer but a more active phenomenon. Much like the supporters of French opera see *tragédies lyriques* as using the

⁴⁰ Fumaroli shows that the former came from the latter in the seventeenth century, *L'Âge de l'éloquence*, 20.

⁴¹ See *Ibid.*, 22. Similarly, whereas eloquence in France has attained a level of prestige reserved for only a few in the seventeenth century, its position is reconsidered throughout the quarrel.

⁴² "A Murakami character is always, in a sense, translating between radically different worlds," writes Sam Anderson in "The Fierce Imagination of Haruki Murakami."

merveilleux to achieve reality within the context of the operatic world, the quarrel's framers stay true to the veracity innate to each of the quarrel's components: they use scientific terms in their demonstrations, literary techniques in their storytelling, all the essential principles of eloquence in the framing and assessment of argumentation; they also seek to look at the debate from outside (be it by adopting a foreign point of view—literally as foreigners or through the elaboration of notions of otherness we examined in Chapter 1—, through sincere attempts at impartiality, or in their reflections on precisely what it means to be French) and from within (in the *coin du roi*'s defense of patriotism, as in the *coin de la reine*'s essentially French approach) throughout their various explorations. These acts of translation all seem aimed at ensuring the survival of eloquence by appealing to a wide cross-section of readers with evolving tastes and varying ideals. They result in a genre that is not easily pinpointed, let alone defined, and that somehow touches the reader, persuading him to value the principles of eloquence as much as to choose a *coin*. These efforts consciously take the mapping on previous debates—the quarrels of Ancients versus Moderns and Atticism versus Asianism in particular—, and form an adapted proposal for the survival of eloquence that mirrors the direction taken by music: the *coin du roi* believes that maintaining the Frenchness of its music is the key to satisfying its public and uses this very approach in its argumentation, while the *coin de la reine* takes the precepts of Italian music and applies them to its texts. There is an attempt to make the central dualities of previous debates more malleable, with both sides using fundamental ancient principles to demonstrate the advantages of their music and their argumentation. The participants thus share a common frame but value different component parts of what they see as eloquence (such as clarity versus ornateness and strong impact versus moral grounding).

In forming this written eloquence that is open to non-specialists and interested in every topic, certain thinkers see the potential for a degradation in quality and a loss of the very rhetorical principles that they are attempting to protect. Thus, in the post scriptum to his letter, Bonneval addresses the quarrel's impact and the danger of its format, expanding on Rousseau's point that musicians compose music, poets write poetry but that it is the philosophers' domain to talk about all of these: "... mais il n'appartient qu'aux Philosophes d'en bien parler. Qui ne se croit pas Philosophe aujourd'hui?"⁴³ This is in fact the beginning of a sort of free for all that we sometimes refer to today as the blogger mentality, with everyone having an equal right to comment (and publish), regardless of their credentials or capacity for reasoning. This is visible even in today's mainstream media, with the principles of journalism increasingly being forsaken in favor of fast-breaking stories. Many quarrel participants, including Rousseau, defend an outmoded view that authority still has value and training of the general sort (as in the knowledge of rhetoric) is needed, but there is a consensus that far greater openness is on the horizon. Bonneval's comment is thus a reflection of both the positive (intentionally removing the *philosophes'* so-called expertise) and the detrimental because when each individual sees himself as an expert (which amounts to enjoying the sound of one's own voice), this severely damages the close listening strongly advocated by both sides. Similarly, Castel constructs an attack on the *philosophes*, whose attempt to be experts in everything is translated as laziness. He seems to imply that their meddling results in a dearth of true expertise in any given area. Thus, he compares them to the ancient Greeks: "l'oisiveté spéculative de leurs arts républicains et

⁴³ Bonneval, *Apologie de la musique*, in *QB*, 1077.

politiques, tournés comme tout le reste en bel esprit.”⁴⁴ This depiction is a criticism of theorizing or philosophizing lazily (if beautifully). Philosophers (as represented by the adjective “spéculative”) are more concerned with appearing clever than actually reaching any sort of depth. This resembles a common debate today, in which we find too much specialization on the one hand (in scholars, for instance), and too many distractions or not enough specialization on the other (in the form of bloggers and the like). In both cases, the agreement concerning the rules necessary to maintaining a certain standard and a level of authority has been lost.

By reconciling a certain quest for freedom of expression and the need for a common framework like the one offered by the principles of eloquence, we can see similarities in many fields, including jazz. Thus, Bill Evans said in an interview: “... no matter how far I might diverge or find freedom in this format, it only is free insofar as it has reference to the strictness of the original form. And that’s what gives it its strength.”⁴⁵ While Evans’ comment is reminiscent of the classical idea of originality built on past works, it also expresses a sentiment that a combination of communal rules and individuality leads to the most impactful music. Our relation to the arts and to writing today resembles what the quarrel’s authors seem to feel in the decline of eloquence: the loss of a common set of rules yields uncontrolled, erratic evolution. Performance practices find themselves completely altered and the Internet allows anyone and anything to get “published.” The place of serious criticism (and indeed the position of critics) is consequently diminishing. Yet, such adaptations are a necessary component of evolution, as Rousseau clearly realized in his fear that a return to simplicity, while ideal, was not really achievable. It is in this context that widely-used, incorrect grammar eventually becomes part of the official language,

⁴⁴ Castel, *Réponse critique d’un Académicien de Rouen*, in *QB*, 1462.

⁴⁵ See Louis Cavrell’s 1966 documentary, *The Universal Mind of Bill Evans*.

and little-used components eventually disappear, much in the way that eloquence's role begins to shift in the 1750s.

It is clear that music was chosen as a topic in part because of its familiarity (and its use in previous debates), its centrality in courtly society and its ability to serve as a conduit for other topics. However, the quarrelers are also sincerely interested in music's power, as we saw, and in its role within intellectual production. This is a question that continues to be explored and may never fully be resolved. For example, the Estonian composer Arvo Pärt recently completed a series of installations in New York City for the second edition of the Guggenheim Museum's "Stillspotting"⁴⁶ intended to examine the relationship between space and sound by immersing visitors in a controlled environment, complete with specially-selected music (and with certain locations playing specifically-selected pieces of music at given intervals from start to end). Interestingly, Pärt's contention is that reducing, controlling and simplifying the sounds that surround us results in deep sensory reactions, even if unconsciously. Murray Perrahia similarly warns young pianists to avoid being "too notey," explaining that they must seek out a musical phrase's overall idea in order to stress what is important, rather than every individual note.⁴⁷ Thus, simplicity, determining the central and removing the ornamental remain vital concepts in the exploration of music's role and impact even today. However, in his installations, Pärt also felt the need to include visual cues in the form of big, white balloons at each site chosen for the

⁴⁶ The program took place at a number of venues throughout lower Manhattan and on Governors Island in September 2011. Each of the five sites was a designated "stillspot" or area of reflection, complete with visual and auditory components. Arvo Pärt's project was part of a two-year multidisciplinary undertaking organized by the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum's Architecture and Urban Studies program (the others taking place in New York's outer boroughs).

⁴⁷ The remark was made at the aforementioned master class (see footnote 33). Thinking in long phrases is a way of valuing the central and removing the ornamental, and demonstrates the way in which a musician or an author must guide his or her listener or reader.

exhibit. Granted, this was due to his collaboration with the architectural firm Snøhetta, which was responsible for this portion of the project, but it was nevertheless a full collaboration and one could not help but feel these visual elements were intended to grant the status of “art” to the spaces. My personal feeling is that the project’s impact—and, indeed the music’s force—was diminished by this need for an imposed, explicitly-visual reference (as opposed to the natural visual stimuli that were part of the spaces themselves).

Music’s continually-evolving role is also noticeable in the changing practice of concert going. There has been a dramatic increase in applauding in-between the movements of a given piece of classical music throughout New York City’s concert halls in the past decade—a sort of unknowing return to the customs that existed before the turn of the twentieth century.⁴⁸ It is tempting and pleasing to think of this as being due to the resurgence of classical music’s popularity (the proof that a new type of audience, unfamiliar with the genre’s hidden rules or preconceptions, is in attendance). However, I feel it is related to a larger, fundamental shift in our relationship to the arts, as reflected (for instance) by the fact almost no one whispers in museums anymore, even in Europe and certainly at most American venues. This is a fascinating evolution that merits serious study and reveals a continued evolution of the constitutive parts of culture (be

⁴⁸ The practice of withholding applause began in earnest at the turn of the twentieth century in Germany, although it is sometimes misattributed to Wagner, whose decision to not have performers appear for a curtain call during and following *Parsifal* led to the audience misunderstanding his intentions as a request for complete silence (see Curt von Westernhagen’s *Wagner: A Biography*, 582). The confusion led Wagner to explain himself and did plant the seeds of the later custom of silence between opera acts. Under the “applause” article, the eleventh edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica* (published in 1911), 223, describes the shift in concert-going etiquette: “The reverential spirit which abolished applause in church has tended to spread to the theatre and the concert-room, largely under the influence of the quasi-religious atmosphere of the Wagner performances at Baireuth. In Germany (*e.g.* the court theatres at Berlin) applause during the performance and “calling before the curtain” have been officially forbidden, but even in Germany this is felt to be in advance of public opinion.” Debates on the issue raged in the 1920s, when the practice gradually became common thanks in part to conductors such as Otto Klemperer and Wilhelm Furtwängler. The issue remained thorny and others, such as Erich Leinsdorf, spoke out against what they saw as artificial restraint.

it the art forms themselves, the public and its interaction with these, or, in the case of music, the performers) and their roles. Although they do not address this particular dimension of musical and societal evolution, the number of books devoted to elucidating music's role has been multiplied in recent years. Dating back to classics such as Anthony Storr's 1992 *Music and the Mind*, such recent inquiries include Oliver Sacks' 2007 *Musicophilia: Tales of Music and the Brain* (the first of his books devoted specifically to music, following a long line of musical explorations in his other works), Daniel Levitin's *This Is Your Brain on Music: the Science of a Human Obsession* (2006), Aniruddh Patel's *Music, Language, and the Brain* (2007), which not only revisits the link of music to language but also traces this correlation back to ancient Greece, and Mark Changizi's *Harnessed: How Language and Music Mimicked Nature and transformed Ape to Man* (2011). If there is a common thread among these works, it is obviously the linking of music and the brain: today's researchers seek to explain scientifically, or even clinically, what makes music so special. However, this tendency also reveals an acknowledgement that music has a special effect on our minds and many of the texts, including Sacks', focus on this quality. The question really remains the same to the one posed by the quarrelers: why and how does music touch us and have such a profound impact? The scientific community has done much to explain the phenomenon from a medical perspective—with neurologists pinpointing the circumstances under which the brain responds to certain types of music—, as in conferences like the one organized by the Cleveland Clinic and Lincoln Center in 2009 titled simply "Music and the Brain,"⁴⁹ or in articles like *Scientific American Mind's* "Why Music Moves Us,"⁵⁰ but the nucleus of the question remains largely unanswered.

⁴⁹ The symposium, "Music and the Brain," was held at Lincoln Center in New York City on October 30 2009,

The *querelle des bouffons* manages to investigate such complex questions despite being one of most fiercely divided and divisive debates—in which choosing a side is a prerequisite to participation and it is not permissible to shift from one to the other as in past battles. This is because it is flexible and, on close reading, internally supplements its central duality with wide-ranging foci and by incorporating numerous areas of exploration into its subtext (in which, as we have underscored, it is perfectly acceptable—and participants are even encouraged—to incorporate elements normally aligned with the other side). This apparent paradox is in fact a way of dissimulating in a manner that appears traditional the formation of a new type of conversation based on the essential principles of eloquence and using music as its model. Within this fresh vision of eloquent conversation, many elements of rhetoric are prized by both *coins* but considered differently and addressed via two contrasting views of ideal music, which hold true from start to finish. The result is applicable to each side's overarching approach to critical thinking and to the numerous topics of debate. The *coin du roi* relies on an enlightened form of intellectual pleasure that is achieved by overcoming difficulty, whereas the *coin de la reine*'s desire for clarity and simplicity is best encapsulated in Rousseau's own summary of his *Lettre*

gathering medical professionals—neuroscientists, physicians and music therapists—from around the country (as well as a few from abroad), whose specialties or research focuses on music in some fashion. The discussants addressed such issues as the effect of music on the autonomic nervous system or the thalamocortical system, music as a stress-reliever and as alleviating pain during treatments such as chemotherapy, developments in neurologic musical therapy, music as a generator of motor expression—creating a physical desire for movement—, the difference in brain activity between musicians and non-musicians when listening to music, the question of whether listening to classical music helps children increase their intelligence quotient, and whether the “Mozart effect” exists (the researcher responsible for this presentation concluding that studies carried out on this topic were flawed because they failed to control biological types).

⁵⁰ Karen Schrock's article cites sources such as Stephen Pinker and Oliver Sacks in its exploration of research concerning “music's power over human emotions and its benefits to our mental and physical well-being” (“Why Music Moves Us,” 32). One of Schrock's contentions is that music offers a method of communication rooted in emotions, rather than in meaning, and that the effect of music is predictable (i.e. it affects people similarly—like a universal language). Thus, medical evidence appears to support certain of the observations made by the *querelle*'s thinkers.

sur la musique française: “il faut en un mot, que le tout ensemble ne porte à la fois qu'une mélodie à l'oreille et qu'une idée à l'esprit.”⁵¹ This succinct summation of the monograph's main thesis, offered almost exactly at the letter's midpoint—as if to reward the careful reader with a pearl at the center of an oyster—, reveals not only music's awesome power but also its association to intellectual endeavors, forming a bridge between the *coin de la reine*'s theories and something of an embrace of the French approach to critical thinking as far as theory and the quarrel's conceptualization are concerned, all the while reducing this view to an essence that incorporates the lessons of Italian music and the *coin*'s overall allegiance to ancient principles.

So, if the relationship between eloquence and music in the *querelle des bouffons* simultaneously provided the essential principles around which the debate was constructed and the means by which it could be judged, it also resolved for the eighteenth century something we still grapple with today: it allowed for all sorts of ideas to be heard and numerous topics of debate to be broached, yet managed to maintain common standards. In an interview hosted by Alain Finkielkraut, historian Roger Chartier and sociologist Olivier Donnat addressed a similar paradox within the context of a discussion on the history of the book.⁵² Chartier opposes “lecture soutenue” to “lecture fragmentée,” the latter representing our rapport to text in the era of the Internet, with little snippets consumed here and there, while the former is the more traditional reading of a whole book (as in the case of a novel). For his part, Donnat delves into access to knowledge (i.e. the book) versus communication: for him, the two were once divided but are now combined. In his conclusion, Finkielkraut adds that, today, mainstream reading demands interactivity—from tweets to emails, when one reads, one also has the opportunity to participate

⁵¹ Rousseau, *Lettre sur la musique française*, 158.

⁵² Finkielkraut, “Le Livre, son passé, son avenir.” The debate was aired on France Culture in July 2012.

(what he refers to as “le paradigme communicationnel” of new media, using video games as an example)—, and wonders how the two types of reading (the traditional sort versus the modern, interactive version) can be reconciled. The *querelle des bouffons* succeeded in accomplishing just that. Throughout the debate, the participants—pamphleteers and readers alike—are free to head in multiple directions, following or responding to the pamphlets they find interesting and using these as stepping stones from which to travel back and forth. They contribute through their own serious responses, based on fragmented and selective readings of previous works, as well as through what one could characterize as the eighteenth century version of social media—discussions in salons and cafés. Yet, sustained reading manages to co-exist with this fragmentation and is in fact required of serious participants. The latter are tasked with seeking out authorial intent through close readings and analyses based on philological work that is traditionally reserved for longer works. Such aims could easily have led to mutual exclusion or bedlam but are brought together by the quarrel’s thinkers: the two *coins* are able to agree on their overarching quest to define music’s position in its relationship with eloquence but differentiate themselves by taking opposite paths to reach their aim. In a sense, the *coin de la reine* prioritizes its immediate goals (incarnated by melody) and keeps the debate’s other facets hidden internally for the close reader to discover, believing in Rousseau’s precept that “une mélodie à l’oreille et ... une idée à l’esprit” is the most effective way of achieving musical eloquence and making a winning argument. For its part, the *coin du roi* propels its opponents’ concealed multiplicity to the forefront, sometimes to the detriment of its guiding theses and reversing Rousseau’s principle by appealing to the French reader’s proclivity for pleasure through intellectual challenges. The end result is a lively, heterogeneous conversation that is governed by shared rhetorical values but

in which the opposition of two very different worldviews is what allows for the formation of its in-depth, wide-ranging discussions.

– Bibliography –

Adam, Antoine. *Grandeur and Illusion: French Literature and Society 1600-1715*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1972.

Anderson, Sam. "The Fierce Imagination of Haruki Murakami." *The New York Times*, October 21 2011. Web. Accessed 21 October 2011.

Adorno, Theodore. *Essays on Music*. Ed. Richard Leppert. Berkeley, CA: University of California, 2002.

André, Yves-Marie. *Essai sur le Beau: Où l'On Examine Précisément le Beau dans le Physique, dans le Moral, dans les Ouvrages d'Esprit, et dans la Musique*. Paris: Hypployte-Louis Guérin, 1741.

_____. *Essai sur le Beau: Nouvelle Édition Augmentée de Six Discours, sur le Modus, sur le Decorum, sur les Graces, sur l'Amour du Beau, sur l'Amour Désintéressé*. Paris: L. Étienne Ganeau, 1770.

Anon. ("M. R. P."), "Article VII, Lettre au P. B. J. sur des Ouvrages qui ne Seront point Imprimés," *Mémoires pour l'Histoire des Sciences et des Beaux Arts*, v. 1, Briasson et Chaubert: Paris, 1752.

Anthony, James. "The Musical Structure of Lully's Operatic Airs." *Jean-Baptiste Lully: Actes de Colloque*. Laaber: Laaber-Verlag, 1990.

Aristotle. *The Complete Works of Aristotle: The Revised Oxford Translation*. Ed. Jonathan Barnes. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University, 1995.

Bach, Johann Sebastian. *Johannes-Passion*. Full Score. c. 1739-1749. Composer's manuscript.

Bardez, Jean-Michel. *Les Écrivains et la Musique au XVIIIe: Philosophes, Encyclopédistes, Musiciens, Théoriciens*. Geneva: Slatkine, 1980.

Banister, H. C. "Music as Language." *Proceedings of the Musical Association*, 12th Sess., 1885-1886.

Barry, Kevin. *Language, Music and the Sign: a Study in Aesthetics, Poetics and Poetic Practices from Collins to Coleridge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1987.

Bartel, Dietrich. *Musica Poetica*. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska, 1997.

Benoit, Marcelle. *Dictionnaire de la Musique Française aux XVIIe et XVIIIe Siècles*. Paris: Fayard, 1992.

_____. *L'Europe Musicale au Temps de Louis XIV*. Paris: Zurfluh, 1998.

_____. *Les Événements Musicaux sous le Règne de Louis XIV*. Paris: Picard, 2004.

Bianconi, Lorenzo. *Music in the Seventeenth Century*. Trans. David Bryant. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1987.

Blainville, Charles Henri de. *L'Esprit de l'Art Musical, ou, Réflexions sur la Musique et ses Différentes Parties*. Geneva: Minkoff, 1974.

Bol, Hans. *La Basse de Viole du Temps de Marin Marais et d'Antoine Fourqueray*. Bilthoven, Netherlands: A. B. Creyghton, 1973.

- Bolduc, Benoît. *Andromède au Rocher: Fortune Théâtrale d'une Image en France et en Italie, (1587- 1712)*. Florence: L.S. Olschki, 2002.
- Bonds, Mark. *Wordless Rhetoric: Musical Form and the Metaphor of the Oration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1991.
- Bourdelot, Pierre. *Conversations Académiques tirées de l'Académie*. Paris: Claude Barbin, 1674.
- _____. *Histoire de la Musique et de ses Effets*. Graz, Austria: Akademische Drück, 1966.
- Boyer, Noël. *La Guerre des Bouffons et la Musique Française*. Paris: Les Éditions de la Nouvelle France, 1945.
- Bray, Bernard and Christoph Strosetzki, eds. *Art de la Lettre, Art de la Conversation à l'Époque Classique en France: Actes du Colloque de Wolfenbüttel, Octobre 1991*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1995.
- Brown, Howard Mayer. "Ut Musica Poesis: Music and Poetry in France of the Late Sixteenth Century." *Early Music History*, v. 13, 1994.
- Buelow, Goerge. "Music, Rhetoric, and the Concept of the Affections: A Selective Bibliography." *Notes*, v. 30, 1973-1974.
- Burmeister, Joachim. *Musica Poetica (1606)*. Trans. Agathe Sueuer and Pascal Dubreuil. Wavre, Belgium: Mardaga, 2007.
- Burney, Charles. *An Eighteenth-Century Musical Tour in France and Italy; Being Dr. Charles Burney's Account of his Musical Experiences as it Appears in his Published Volume with which Are Incorporated his Travel Experiences According to his Original Intention*. London: Oxford, 1959.

_____. *The Present State of Music in France and Italy or the Journal of a Tour through those Countries, Undertaken to Collect Materials for a General History of Music*. London: T. Becket, 1771.

Butler, Gregory. "Fugue and Rhetoric." *Journal of Music Theory*, v. 12, n. 1, 1977.

_____. "J.S. Bach and the Concord-Discord Paradox." *The Journal of Musicology*, v. 9, n. 3, 1991.

Cannone, Belinda. *Philosophies de la Musique (1752-1789)*. Paris: Belles Lettres, 1990.

Carruthers, Mary. "Varietas: a Word of Many Colours." *Zeitschrift für Sprach und Literaturwissenschaft*, v. 41, 2009.

Carvalho, Mario Vieira de. "'Nature et Naturel' dans la Polémique sur l'Opéra au XVIIIème Siècle." In *Le Parole della Musica. 11: Studi sul Lessico della Letteratura Critica del Teatro Musicale in Onore di Gianfranco Folena*. Ed. Maria Teresa Muraro. Florence: Leo S. Olschki Editore, 1995.

Castel, Louis-Bertrand. *L'Optique des Couleurs: Fondée sur les Simples Observations, et Tournée, de la Teinture, et des Autres Arts Coloristes*. Paris: Briasson, 1740.

Castil-Blaze, François-Henri-Joseph. *Molière Musicien*. Paris: Castil-Blaze, 1852.

Cavrell, Louis, dir. *The Universal Mind of Bill Evans*. Rhapsody Films, 1966. Film.

Cernuschi, Alain. *Penser la Musique dans l'Encycloédie*. Paris: Champion, 2000.

_____. "D'Alembert Pris au Jeu de la Musique: Ses Interventions Musicographiques dans l'Encyclopédie." *Recherches sur Diderot et sur l'Encyclopédie*, n. 21, 1996.

Changizi, Mark. *Harnessed: How Language and Music Mimicked Nature and Transformed Ape to Man*. Dallas: BenBella Books, 2011.

- Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *De Inventione*. Trans. H.M. Hubbell. Cambridge, MA: Loeb Classical Library, 1949.
- _____. *Œuvres*. Trans. M. Nisard. Paris: Fermin Didot, Frères, 1869.
- _____. *De Oratore*. Trans. G. L. Hendrickson. Cambridge, MA: Loeb Classical Library, 1979.
- _____. *L'Orateur*. Trans. Albert Yon. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1964.
- _____. *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. Trans. Harry Caplan. Cambridge, MA: Loeb Classical Library, 1999.
- Close, A. J. "Commonplace Theories of Art and Nature in Classical Antiquity and in the Renaissance." *Journal of the History of Ideas*, v. 30, n. 4, 1969.
- Cohen, Albert. "Symposium on Seventeenth-Century Music Theory: France." *Journal of Music Theory*, n. 16, 1972.
- Conley, Thomas. *Rhetoric in the European Tradition*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1990.
- Cornell, J. H. *The Boundaries of Music and Poetry: A Study in Musical Aesthetics*. New York: Schirmer, 1893.
- Cowart, Georgia. *The Origins of Modern Musical Criticism: French and Italian Music, 1600-1750*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1981.
- Cranston, Maurice. *Jean-Jacques: The Early Life and Work of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, 1712-1754*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1991.
- Dainville, François de. *L'Education des Jésuites*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1978.
- Davidson, Hugh. *Audience, Words, and Art: Studies in Seventeenth-Century French Rhetoric*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University, 1965.
- Derrida, Jacques. *De la Grammatologie*. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit, 1967.

Désesquelles, Anne-Claire. *L'Expression Musicale*. Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang, 1999.

Descartes, René. *Compendium Musicae: Abrégé de Musique*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1987.

_____. *Œuvres*. Ed. Victor Cousin. Paris: F.G. Levrault, 1753.

_____. *Traité sur les Passions de l'Âme*. Paris: Michel Bobin, 1664.

Diderot, Denis. *Le Neveu de Rameau*. Paris: Garnier-Flammarion, 1993.

_____. *Œuvres Complètes*. Paris: Garnier Frères, 1875.

Diderot et al. *Encyclopédie ou Dictionnaire Raisonné des Arts, des Sciences et des Métiers*, Paris: Briasson, 1751-1772.

Didier, Béatrice. *La Musique des Lumières*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1985.

Dublin University Magazine: A Literary and Political Journal, v. 68. Dublin: George Herbert, 1866.

Dubos, Jean-Baptiste. *Histoire Critique de l'Établissement de la Monarchie*. Paris: La Veuve Ganot, 1742.

_____. *Réflexions Critiques sur la Poésie et la Peinture*. Paris: Pierre-Jean Mariette, 1733.

Edelstein, Dan. *The Enlightenment: A Genealogy*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 2010.

Eden, Kathy. *Hermeneutics and the Rhetorical Tradition*. New Haven, CT: Yale University, 1997.

Encyclopaedia Britannica. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1911.

Estève, Pierre. *L'Esprit des Beaux-Arts*. Paris: C. J. Baptiste Bauche Fils, 1753.

- _____. *Nouvelle Découverte du Principe de l'Harmonie avec un Examen de ce que M. Rameau A Publié sous le Titre de Démonstration de ce Principe 1752*. Ed. A. Charrak. Lyon: ENS Editions, 1997.
- Fabiano, Andrea et al. *La "Querelle des Bouffons" dans la vie Culturelle Française du XVIIIe Siècle*. Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 2005.
- Fénelon, François. *Les Aventures de Télémaque*. Paris: Hachette, 1927.
- _____. *Dialogues sur l'Éloquence en Général et celle de la Chaire en Particulier*. Paris: Hachette, 1861.
- _____. *Œuvres*. Paris: L. Tenré, 1822.
- Fétis, François Joseph. *Biographie Universelle des Musiciens*. Paris: Fermin Didot Frères, Fils et Cie., 1860.
- Finkelkraut, Alain. "L'Héritage de Rousseau." *Répliques*. France Culture, 5 May 2012. Radio.
- _____. "Le Livre, son Passé, son Avenir." *Répliques*. France Culture, 14 July 2012. Radio.
- Force, Pierre. *Le Problème Herméneutique chez Pascal*, Paris: Vrin, 1989.
- _____. "Peinture et Poésie dans le *Télémaque* de Fénelon" in *Revue de Littératures Française et Comparée*, v. 3, 1994.
- France, Peter. *Rhetoric and Truth in France: Descartes to Diderot*. Oxford: Oxford University, 1972.
- Fréron, *L'Année Littéraire*. Amsterdam and Paris: Michel Lambert, 1754.
- Fubini, Enrico. *Music and Culture in Eighteenth-Century Europe: A Source Book*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1994.
- Fumaroli, Marc. *L'Age de l'Éloquence*. Geneva: Droz, 2002.

- _____. *Héros et Orateurs*. Geneva: Droz, 1996.
- _____. “Des Abeilles et des araignées” in *La Querelle des Anciens et des Modernes*, ed. Anne-Marie Lecocq, Paris: Gallimard, 2001.
- _____. “La Conversation” in *Lieux de Mémoire*, v. 2, ed. Pierre Nora. Paris: Gallimard, 1993.
- Fumaroli, Marc, ed. *Histoire de la Rhétorique dans l’Europe Moderne: 1450-1950*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1999.
- Georgiades, Thrasybulos. *Music and Language: The Rise of Western Music as Exemplified in Settings of the Mass*. Trans. Marie Louise Göllner. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1982.
- Gerbino, Giuseppe. *Music and the myth of Arcadia in Renaissance Italy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2009.
- Gibson, Jonathan. *Le Naturel and L’Éloquence: The Aesthetics of Rhetoric and Music in France, 1650-1715*. Diss. Duke University, 2003.
- Goldsmith, Elizabeth. *Exclusive Conversations: The Art of Interaction in Seventeenth-Century France*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1988.
- Grafton, Anthony. *The Footnote: A Curious History*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1999.
- _____. “The Footnote from De Thou to Ranke.” *History and Theory*, v. 33, n. 4, 1994.
- Grimm, Melchior von. *Correspondance Littéraire et Philosophique*. Paris: Furne, 1829.
- Grove Dictionary of Musicians*. Ed. George Grove. London: Macmillan and Company, 1880.
- Harran, Don. “Elegance as a Concept in Sixteenth-Century Music Criticism.” *Renaissance Quarterly*, v. 41, n. 3, 1988.

Harris-Warrick, Rebecca. "The Phrase Structures of Lully's Dance Music." *Lully Studies*.

Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2000.

Heartz, Daniel. "Diderot et le Théâtre Lyrique: Le "Nouveau Stile" Proposé par Le Neveu de

Rameau." *Revue de Musicologie*, v. 64, n. 2, 1978.

Howell, Wilbur. *Eighteenth-Century British Logic and Rhetoric*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton

University, 1971.

Isherwood, Robert. *Music in the Service of the King: France in the Seventeenth Century*. Ithaca,

NY: Cornell University, 1973.

Jamain, Claude. *L'Imaginaire de la Musique au Siècle des Lumières*. Paris: Honoré Champion,

2003.

Jobs, Steve. "WWDC 2010 Keynote Address." *Macworld*, June 2010. Web. Accessed 7 June

2010.

Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Judgment*. Trans. J. H. Bernard. London: Macmillan, 1914.

Kapp, Volker. "L'Apogée de l'Atticisme Français ou l'Éloquence qui se Moque de la Rhétorique

(1690-1730)" in Fumaroli, *Histoire de la Rhétorique dans l'Europe Moderne*.

Kelly, Christopher. *Rousseau as Author: Consecrating One's Life to the Truth*. Chicago:

University of Chicago, 2003.

Kintzler, Catherine. *Poétique de l'Opéra Français: de Corneille à Rousseau*. Paris: Minerve,

1991.

_____. *Théâtre et Opéra à l'Âge Classique: Une Familière Étrangeté*. Paris: Fayard, 2001.

Kirkendale, Ursula. "The Source of the "Musical Offering:" the "Institutio Oratore" of

Quintilian" in *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, v. 33, n. 1, 1980.

Kirkendale, Walter. "Ciceronians versus Aristotelians on the Ricercar as Exordium from Bembo to Bach" in *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, v. 32, n. 1, 1979.

_____. *Fugue and Fugato in Rococo and Classical Chamber Music*. Durham, NC: Duke, 1979.

Kleinman, Sidney. *La Solmisation Mobile: De Jean-Jacques Rousseau à John Curwen*. Paris: Heugel, 1974.

Laborde, Jean-Benjamin. *Essai sur la musique ancienne et moderne*. Paris: Imprimerie de Ph.-D. Pierres, 1780.

Lang, Paul. "The Enlightenment and Music." *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, v. 1, n. 1, 1967.

Langer, Susanne. *Philosophy in a New Key: A Study in the Symbolism of Reason, Rite, and Art*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1957.

Launay, Denise, ed. *La Querelle des Bouffons: Texte des Pamphlets*. Geneva: Minkoff, 1973.

Le Cerf de la Viéville, *Comparaison de la Musique Italienne et de la Musique Française*.

Brussels: François Foppens, 1705. (Geneva: Minkoff, 1972.)

_____. *L'Art de Décrier ce qu'On Entend Point ou le Médecin Musicien*. Brussels: François Foppens, 1706.

Lecoq, Anne-Marie, ed. *La Querelle des Anciens et des Modernes*. Paris: Gallimard, 2001.

Legrand, Raphaëlle. "La Rhétorique en Scène: Quelques Perspectives pour l'Analyse de la Tragédie en Musique." *Revue de Musicologie*, v. 84, 1998.

Lesure, François, ed. *La Querelle des Gluckistes et des Piccinistes: Texte des Pamphlets*. Geneva: Minkoff, 1984.

Levitin, Daniel. *This Is Your Brain on Music: the Science of a Human Obsession*. New York: Penguin, 2006.

Lully, Jean-Baptiste. *Ballet Royal d'Alcidiane: Divisé en Trois Parties, Dansé par sa Majesté*. Full score. Versailles: André Danican Philidor, 1658.

_____. *Armide: Tragédie Mise en Musique par M. Lully, Escuyer, Conseiller, Secrétaire du Roi, Maison, Couronne de France et de ses Finances, et Sur-Intendant de la Musique de sa Majesté*. Paris: Christophe Ballard, 1686.

Mace, Dean. "Marin Mersenne on Language and Music." *Journal of Music Theory*, v. 14, n. 1, 1970.

Marmontel, Jean-François. *Mémoires* in *Bibliothèque des Mémoires Relatifs à l'Histoire de France Pendant le Dix-Huitième Siècle*, v. 5. Paris: Librairie de Firmin-Didot et Compagnie, 1878.

Masson, Paul-Marie. "La "Lettre sur Omphale" (1752)." *Revue de Musicologie*, v. 24, n. 73-74, 1945.

Mattheson, Johann. *Der Vokemmene Capellmesiter*. Trans. Ernest Harriss. Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Research Press, c. 1981.

McClary, Susan. "Temporality and Ideology: Qualities of Motion in Seventeenth-Century French Music." *Echo*, v. 2, n. 2, 2000.

McCreless, Patrick. "Rhetoric and Music." *The Cambridge History of Western Music Theory*. Ed. Thomas Christensen. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2002.

- Melzer, Sara, ed. *From the Royal to the Republican Body: Incorporating the Political in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century France*. Berkeley, CA: University of California, 1998.
- Meyer, Leonard. *Emotion and Meaning in Music*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1956.
- Michaud, Joseph, et al. *Biographie Universelle, Ancienne et Moderne, ou Histoire par Ordre Alphabétique de la Vie Publique et Privée de tous les Hommes qui se Sont Fait Remarquer par leurs Ecrits, leurs Actions, leurs Talents, leurs Vertus ou leurs Crimes*. Paris: Madame C. Desplaces, 1810.
- Mersenne, Marin. *Traité de l'Harmonie Universelle*. Paris: Fayard, 2003.
- Millin, Aubin Louis. *Dictionnaire des Beaux-Arts*. Paris: Desray, 1806.
- Molière. *Œuvres*. Paris: Hachette, 1873.
- Montagu, Jennifer. *The Expression of Passions: The Origin and Influence of Charles Le Brun's "Conférence sur l'Expression Générale et Particulière."* New Haven, CT: Yale University, 1994.
- Moore, Fabienne. *Prose Poems of the French Enlightenment: Delimiting Genre*. Surrey, England: Ashgate Publishing, 2009.
- New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, v. 21. Oxford: Oxford University, 2007.
- Norman, Larry. *The Shock of the Ancient: Literature and History in Early Modern France*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 2011.
- Oates, Joyce Carol, ed. *The Oxford Book of Short Stories*. Oxford: Oxford University, 1992.

- O'Dea, Michael. "Consonances et Dissonances: Rousseau et D'Alembert Face à l'Œuvre Théorique de Jean-Philippe Rameau." *Recherches sur Diderot et sur l'Encyclopédie*, n. 25, 2003.
- _____. "Rousseau Contre Rameau: Musique et Nature dans les Articles pour l'Encyclopédie et au-Delà." *Recherches sur Diderot et sur l'Encyclopédie*, n. 17, 1994.
- Oliver, Alfred. *The Encyclopedists as Critics of Music*. New York: Columbia University, 1947.
- Pascal, Blaise. *Pensées*. Ed. Philippe Sellier. Paris: Classiques Garnier, 1991.
- Patel, Aniruddh. *Music, Language, and the Brain*. Oxford: Oxford University, 2010.
- Pekacz, Jolanta. "The Salonnières and the Philosophes in Old Regime France: The Authority of Aesthetic Judgment." *Journal of the History of Ideas*, v. 60, n. 2, 1999.
- Pergolesi, Giovanni. *La Serva Padrona*. Full score. Vienna: Karl Geiringer, 1925.
- _____. *Stabat Mater*. Full score. Biblioteca del Conservatorio, Naples. Composer's manuscript.
- Pinker, Steven. *How the Mind Works*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1997.
- _____. *The Stuff of Thought: Language As a Window Into Human Nature*. New York: Penguin, 2008.
- Pintard, René. *Le Libertinage Érudit dans la Première Moitié du XVIIe Siècle*. Geneva: Slatkine, 1983.
- Plato. *The Collected Dialogues: Including the Letters*. Ed. Edith Hamilton and Huntington Cairns. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University, 1961.
- _____. *Symposium in The Collected Dialogues*. Trans. Michael Joyce. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University, 1963.

QB. See Launay, Denise.

Quintilian, Marcus Fabius. *Institutio Oratoria*. Trans. H.E. Butler. Cambridge, MA: Loeb Classical Library, 1920.

Raguenet, François. *Défense du Parallèle des Italiens et des Français en ce qui Regarde la Musique et l'Opéra*. Paris: Claude Barbin, 1705.

_____. *Parallèle des Italiens et des Français en ce qui Regarde la Musique et l'Opéra*. Paris: Jean Moreau, 1702.

Rameau, Jean-Philippe. *Démonstration du Principe de l'Harmonie: Servant de Base à Tout l'Art Musical Théorique et Pratique*. Paris: Durant et Pissot, 1750.

_____. *Erreurs sur la Musique dans l'Encyclopédie*. Paris: Sebastien Jorry, 1755. (Geneva: Slatkine, 1971.)

_____. *Nouveau Système de Musique Théorique: Où l'on Découvre le Principe de Toutes les Règles Nécessaires à la Pratique, pour Servir d'Introduction au Traité de l'Harmonie*. Paris: Jean-Baptiste-Christophe Ballard, 1726.

_____. *Platée: Comédie-Ballet Mise en Musique*. Paris: Jean-Philippe Rameau, 1749.

_____. *Réponse de M. Rameau à MM. les Éditeurs de l'“Encyclopédie” sur leur Dernier Avertissement*. London: S. Jorry, 1757.

_____. *Suite des Erreurs sur la Musique dans l'Encyclopédie*. Paris: s.n., 1756.

_____. *Traité de l'Harmonie Réduite à ses Principes*. Paris: Jean-Baptiste-Christophe Ballard, 1722.

Ranum, Patricia. “Audible Rhetoric and Mute Rhetoric: The Seventeenth-Century French Sarabande.” *Early Music*, n. 24, 1986.

- _____. "Do French Dance Songs Obey the Rules of Rhetoric?" *Fluting and Dancing: Articles and Reminiscences*. New York: McGinnis and Marx, 1992.
- _____. *The Harmonic Orator: The Phrasing and Rhetoric of the Melody in French Baroque Airs*. Hillsdale NY: Pendragon Press, 2001.
- Riley, Patrick. "The General Will Before Rousseau." *Political Theory*, v. 6, n. 4, 1978.
- Rosow, Lois. "The Articulation of Lully's Dramatic Dialogues." *Lully Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2000.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *Discours sur les Sciences et les Arts*. Ed. Jacques Roger. Garnier Flammarion: Paris, 1971.
- _____. *Le Devin du Village*. Paris: V. de Lormel et Fils, 1753.
- _____. *Le Devin du Village*. Full score. Paris: M. le Duc, 1753.
- _____. *Essai sur l'Origine des Langues: Où il est Parlé de la Mélodie et de l'Imitation Musicale*. Ed. Catherine Kintzler. Paris: Garnier Flammarion, 1993.
- _____. *Examen de Deux Principes Avancés par M. Rameau, dans sa Brochure Intitulée Erreurs sur la Musique dans l'Encyclopédie in Essai sur l'Origine des Langues*. Paris: Garnier Flammarion, 1993.
- _____. *Julie ou la Nouvelle Héloïse*. Ed. Michel Launay. Garnier Flammarion: Paris, 1967.
- _____. *Lettre sur la Musique Française in Essai sur l'Origine des Langues*. Paris: Garnier Flammarion, 1993.
- _____. *Œuvres*. Paris: Alexandre Houssiot, 1826.

- Sabatier, François. *Miroirs de la Musique: La Musique et ses Correspondances avec la Littérature et les Beaux-Arts, de la Renaissance aux Lumières: XVe-XVIIIe Siècles*. Paris: Fayard, 1998.
- Sacks, Oliver. *The Man who Mistook his Wife for A Hat*. New York: Summit Books, 1985.
- _____. *Musicophilia: Tales of Music and the Brain*. New York: Knopf, 2007.
- Said, Edward. *Musical Elaborations*. New York: Columbia University, 1991.
- Schrock, Karen. "Why Music Moves Us." *Scientific American Mind*, July-August 2009.
- Scott, John. "The Harmony Between Rousseau's Musical Theory and his Philosophy." *Journal of the History of Ideas*, v. 59, n. 2, April 1998.
- Sellier, Philippe. *Port-Royal et la Littérature*. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1999.
- Sermain, Jean-Paul. "Le Code du Bon Goût (1725-1750)" in Fumaroli, *Histoire de la Rhétorique dans l'Europe Moderne*.
- Spencer, Edmund, "Legend of Sir Guyon," *The Complete Poetical Works*. Ed. R. E. Neil Dodge. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1908.
- Stalnaker, Joanna. *The Unfinished Enlightenment: Description in the Age of the Encyclopedia*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, 2010.
- Stevens, "Language vs. Color: the Brain and the Language of Visual Arts," *The Origins of Creativity*. Ed. K. Pfenninger and V. Shubik. Oxford: Oxford University, 2001.
- Stone, Harriet. *Classical Model: Literature and Knowledge in Seventeenth-Century France*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, 1996.
- Stone, Jon, ed. *The Routledge Dictionary of Latin Quotations: The Illiterati's Guide to Latin Maxims, Mottoes, Proverbs and Sayings*. New York: Routledge, 2005.

Storr, Anthony. *Music and the Mind*. New York: Harper Collins, 1992.

Suskind, Ronald. "What Is Your Favorite Deep, Elegant or Beautiful Explanation?" *The Edge*, January 2012. Web. Accessed 17 January 2012.

Teplow, Deborah. "Rhetoric and Eloquence: Dramatic Expression in Marin Marais' Pièces de Viole." *Journal of the Viola da Gamba Society of America*, n. 24, 1987.

Thomas, Downing. *Aesthetics of Opera in the Ancien Régime, 1645-1785*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2002.

_____. *Music and the Origins of Language: Theories from the French Enlightenment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1995.

Verba, Cynthia. "The Development of Rameau's Thoughts on Modulation and Chromatics." *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, v. 26, n. 1, 1973.

_____. "Jean-Jacques Rousseau: Radical and Traditional Views in His *Dictionnaire de Musique*." *The Journal of Musicology*, v. 7, n. 3, 1989.

Voltaire, François-Marie Arouet. *Le Siècle de Louis XIV*. Dresden: George Conrad Walther, 1753.

Von Mücke, Dorothea and Veronica Kelly, eds. *Body and Text in the Eighteenth Century*. Satanford, CA: Stanford University, 1994.

Waeber, Jacqueline. "Jean-Jacques Rousseau's 'Unité de Mélodie.'" *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, v. 62, n. 1, 2009.

Walker, D. P. "The Influence of *Musique Mesurée à l'Antique*, Particularly on the *Airs de Cour* in the Early Seventeenth Century." *Musica Disciplina*, v. 2, 1948.

_____. "Some Aspects and Problems of *Musique Mesurée à l'Antique*." *Musica Disciplina*, v. 4, 1950.

Westernhagen, Curt von. *Wagner: A Biography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1981.

"Why Music?" *The Economist*, December 20 2008-January 2 2009.

Wilson, Blake. "Rhetoric and Music," *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, v. 21. Oxford: Oxford University, 2007.

Wolker, Robert. *Rousseau*. Oxford: Oxford University, 1995.

Winn, James Anderson. *Unsuspected Eloquence*. New Haven, CT: Yale University, 1981.

Yates, Frances. *The French Academies of the Sixteenth Century*. New York: Routledge, 1988.

Young, Arthur. *Letters Concerning the Present State of the French Nation*. London: W. Nicoll, 1769.

Zaretsky, Robert, and John Scott. *The Philosophers' Quarrel: Rousseau, Hume, and the Limits of Human Understanding*. New Haven, CT: Yale University, 2009.

Zumthor, Paul. *Le Masque et la Lumière*. Paris: Seuil, 1978.